

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 181

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

| | | |
|---------|---------------|-------|
| VOL. XV | JANUARY, 1940 | No. 1 |
|---------|---------------|-------|

C O N T E N T S

| | PAGE |
|---|------------------------------|
| Shakspeare and His Contemporaries in the literature of 1939: a classified bibliography | <i>S. A. Tannenbaum</i> 2 |
| Shakspeare's Gulls | <i>J. Stewart Schell</i> 23 |
| A Warning-Piece Against Shakspeare's Women . . . | <i>Arthur M. Sampley</i> 34 |
| Montaigne's <i>Apologie</i> and <i>King Lear</i> (Concluded) . . . | <i>W. B. D. Henderson</i> 40 |
| My Gracious Silence! | <i>David Brown</i> 55 |
| Shakspeare - - When? | <i>Ivernia Tyson</i> 57 |
| <i>Communication</i> : McKerrow's New Shakspeare Text . . . | <i>John Wilcox</i> 59 |
| Editorial Comments | 61 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

SHAKESPEARE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

(A Classified Bibliography for 1939)

Compiled by

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

The following bibliography, based on an examination of the contents of more than 1,400 periodicals and hundreds of books, is a continuation of that published in this BULLETIN in January, 1939. Perfunctory notices of books, blurbs, and reviews which contribute nothing new, have not been noted. The names of female writers are distinguished by a colon (instead of a period) after the initial letter of the baptismal name. The titles of books and pamphlets are printed in italics. If no year is mentioned in connection with an item, '1939' is to be understood. Reviews of books are listed (without a preceding number), without title, immediately after the books themselves. The discussion of a book is indicated by printing the title within single quotes. The abbreviations employed herein, and what they stand for, follow herewith:

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|----------------|--|
| A | —Anglia | Ln | —London |
| Abstr. | —Abstract | M | — <i>Modern</i> |
| Amer. | —American | MLN | —Modern Language Notes |
| Archiv | —Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen | MLR | —Modern Language Review |
| B | —Bulletin | Mo | —Monthly |
| bib | —bibliography | MP | —Modern Philology |
| BJRL | —Bulletin of the John Rylands Library | NQ | —Notes and Queries |
| Cambr. | —Cambridge | NSN | —New Statesman & Nation |
| comp. | —compiler | OUP | —Oxford University Press |
| Col. | —Columbia | P | —Press |
| CR | —Contemporary Review | pll | —plots |
| CUP | —Cambridge University Press | PMIA | —Publications of the Modern Language Ass'n |
| Diss. | —Dissertation | port(s) | —portrait(s) |
| d | —der, die, das, dem, etc. | p. p. | —privately printed |
| dt. | —deutsch, deutscher, etc. | PQ | —Philological Quarterly |
| ed., edd. | —editor, editors | Q | —Quarterly |
| ELH | —Journal of English Literary History | QR | —Quarterly Review |
| Eliz'n | —Elizabethan | R | —Review, Revue |
| Engl. | —English, Englische | RES | —Review of English Studies |
| ES | —Englische Studien | Ru | —Russian |
| facs., facs. | —facsimile, facsimiles | SAB | —Shakespeare Ass'n Bulletin |
| f | —fur | SAH | —Stratford Herald |
| Fr | —French | Sh | —Shakespeare, Shakespeare |
| fr | —from | Shn | —Shakespearean |
| Ger | —German | SJ | —Shakespeare Jahrbuch |
| GRM | —Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift | SP | —Studies in Philology |
| HLQ | —Huntington Library Quarterly | RCC | —Revue des Cours et Conférences |
| HUP | —Harvard University Press | TAM | —Theatre Arts Monthly |
| ils | —illustrated, illustrations | TLS | —Times Literary Supplement (Ln) |
| J | —Journal | tr. | —translator |
| JEGP | —Journal of English and Germanic Philology | Tr | —Transactions |
| Libr | —Library | trn | —translation |
| Lit | —Literature | u. | —und |
| | | U | —University |
| | | UP | —University Press |
| | | Xn | —Christian |

A name and title-index will be published in the April issue of the BULLETIN. The compiler's best thanks are due to the publishers, libraries, and personal friends who have assisted him in one way or another in making this compilation.

ABRIDGEMENTS

- 10991 *The Children's Sh.*—E. Nesbit—
N. Y.: Random House, pp. 126, 11s by
R. Klep, \$2

ABROAD

See France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland,
India, Italy, Japan, Russia.

ACTING AND ACTORS

10992. *I Wanted to be an Actress.* [An
autobiography.]—K. Cornell & R. W.
Sedgwick.—N. Y.: Random House, pp.
362, 11s, \$3
10993. T. Shevchenko & Ira Aldridge.—
M. Finkel—International Lit, Mar., pp.
92-93, 2 11s
- 10994 *Sh's Boy Actors.*—W. R. Davies.
—Ln Dent, pp. viii, 208; 8 pl, 10 s.
6 d.—NQ, 176: 215-16, Mar. 25.—TLS,
Feb. 4, p. 74.
10995. Q. Elizabeth's players.—M. M.
Gray.—TLS, Jan 14, pp. 25-26.
10996. *Early Stages.*—J. Griegud.—Ln:
Macmillan, pp. xii, 322; 18 pl.
10997. *Kean*—G. Playfair.—Ln: G. Bles,
pp. x, 346, 8 11s. (N. Y.: Dutton,
\$3.50.
10998. *The Last Tragedian* [E. Booth].—
O. Skinner.—N. Y., pp. xii, 214, 11 pl.
10999. *Eliz'n acting.*—A. Harbage.—
PMLA, 54: 685-708, Sept.

AMERICA

11000. *American Shn Criticism, 1607-
1865.*—A. V. R. Westfall.—N. Y.: H.
W. Wilson Co., pp. xii, 306; \$2.75.
11001. *Sh. in America.*—E. C. Dunn.—
N. Y.: Macmillan, pp. xvi, 310; 8 11s;
\$3.50
11002. The first theatrical company in

America—A. S. W. Posenbach.—Proc.
of the Amer. Artiquarian Soc., Oct.
1938, pp. 3-13, facs. (Repr. 1939).

11003. L. Dunn's *Sh in America*—W. T.
Hastings, Providence Sunday J, Dec. 10.
—G. F. Whicher, N. Y. Herald-Tribune
Books, Nov. 19, p. 16.

ASTROLOGY

11004. Sh & the astrology of his time.—
M. Sondheim—J of the Warburg Insti-
tute, 2: 243-59, Jan.

ASTRONOMY

11005. F. R. Johnson's *Astronomical
Thought in Renaissance England.*—C.
M. Coffin—JEGP, 38: 143-47, Jan.

AUTOGRAPHS

11006. Signatures of Sh—S. Marks.—
TLS, June 10, p. 341.

BACON-SHAK-SPERE IMBROGLIO

11007. Quelques précisions au sujet de
l'acteur Wm. Sh.—Cartier.—Mercure de
France, 291: 92-109, Apr. 1.
11008. Sh, Bacon & Gervinus.—A. A.
Leith.—Baconiana, 24: 32-36, Jan.
11009. The cryptographer's corner.—Ba-
coniana, 24: 37-39, Jan.
11010. Wer schrieb Sh?—I. Seligo.—
Frankf Ztg (1938), nos. 625-26.
11011. Bacon-Sh anatomy.—W. S. Mel-
some.—Baconiana 24: 57-69 (Apr.), 111-
23 (July).
11012. Bacon's two lives.—F. E. C. Hab-
good.—Baconiana, 24: 129-43, July
11013. Bacon's royal birth.—H. Bridge-
water; R. J. A. Bunnnett.—Baconiana, 24:
162-63, July.
11014. Jos. Hall satirizes the Sh family.—
P. Walters.—Baconiana, 24: 144-50,
July.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

- 11015 Bacon, est. Sh.—J. Lemartie.—
Merc de France, 233. 206-12, July
- 11016 Baconian studies—J. Arther.—
Theosophist, 60 429-40 (Aug.), 524-36
(Sept.)
- 11017 A bibliographical account of the
Bacon-Sh controversy—L. Glendenning—
Colophon, Sept., pp. 25-30, 4 facs
- 11018 Ist Sh ein Decknamen?—E. Wach-
ter—Hamb. Tagebl., no. 168.
- Api—B. T. Spencer, Sewanee R., 47.
119-29, Jan
11028. *Sh's Life & Art*—P. Alexander—
Ln. Nisbet, pp. vi, 248, 8s. 6d.—Ba-
coniana, 24 93-100, Apr.
- 11029 *Introducing Sh*—G. B. Harrison
Ln. Penguin Books, 6d.—Baconiana, 24.
158-61, July
- 11030 Sh's coat-of-arms—H. K. Baker—
Baconiana, 24 77-85, Apr., 1939
- 11031 Sh in 1596—A. L. Everett—
SAB, 14 144-57, July.
11032. The mystery of the Sh manu-
scripts—S. A. T.—SAB, 14. 190-91,
July
- 11033 The man who was Sh—B. T.
Spencer—Sewanee R., 47 294-305, Apr.
- 11034 L'etudition de Sh—P. Messiaen
—R. Politique & Littéraire, 77. 181-85,
May.
11035. Ph. Fletcher's marriage [& Sh's].
A. B. Langdale—NQ, 177 327-28,
Nov. 4
See 11007, 11089.

BEAUMONT & FLETCHER

11019. *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, &
Massinger*.—B. Maxwell—Chapel Hill:
U of No. Ca. P., pp. x + 238, \$3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 11020 Sh & his contemporaries: a classi-
fied bibliography for 1938—S. A. Tan-
nenbaum, comp.—SAB, 14. 2-26, Jan.
- 11021 Recent literature of the Renaissance.
—H. Craig, et al.—SP, 36. 253-432,
Apr.
- 11022 American bibliography for 1938.—
M. Henshaw, et al.—PMLA (Supple-
ment), 53. 1213-1312.
11023. Bibliographie zur Gesch. d. literar.
Geschmacks in England—L. L. Schück-
ing—A, 63 1-64.
- 11024 *A Census of Sh's Plays in Quarto,
1594-1709*.—H. C. Bartlett & A. W.
Pollard—New Haven: Yale U. P., pp.
vi, 166, \$10 (Revised ed'n).

BIOGRAPHY

11025. E. I. Frapp's *Sh, Man & Artist*;
B. R. Lewis; SAB, 14: 37-45, Jan.—
A. Walker; RES, 15 213-15, Apr.
- 11026 C. L. de Chambrun's *Sh Redis-
covered*—A. Walker, RES, 15 215-16,
Apr.
- 11027 Muir & O'Loughlin's *Voyage to
Illyria*—K. Tillotson, RES, 15 217-18,

BOOK TITLES

- 11036 *Such Harmony*.—S. Goodyear—
Merchant of Venice, V, 1, 63.
- 11037 *The World Is [Your] Oyster*.—
H. E. Yates—*Merry Wives*, II, 11, 2.
- 11038 *Born of Woman*.—R. Vincent.—
Macbeth, V, iii, 4.
- 11039 *Dead for a Ducat*.—H. Reilly.—
Hamlet, III, iv, 23
- 11040 *The Discovered Country*.—O. R.
Washburn—*Hamlet*, III, 1, 79.
- 11041 *Off With [Her] Head!*—G. D.
H. & M. Cole—*Richard III*, III, iv 78
11042. *There Needs No Ghost*.—R.
Adam—*Hamlet*, I, v, 125
- 11043 *Deeds Ill Done*.—A. Seifert.—
King John, IV, iii, 219
- 11044 *A Poor Player*.—H. H. Child.—
Macbeth, V, v, 24

- 11045 *So Much Blood*.—B. Fischer—*Macbeth*, V, 1, 44
11046. *High Heaven* — *Measure for Measure*, II, 11, 121
- 11047 *False to Any Man*.—L. Foid—*Hamlet*, I, 111, 80.
- 11048 *Poor, Poor Yorick*—F. C. Davis—*Hamlet*, V, 1, 203
- 11049 *Fathom Five*—N. Benjamin.—*The Tempest*, I, 11, 396.
- 11050 *Casual Slaughters*—V. Hanson—*Hamlet*, V, 11, 393.
- 11051 *Too Like the Lightning*—D. Chambers—*Romeo & Juliet*, II, 11, 119
- 11052 *Children's Voices*.—B. E. Roberts & A. T. Beckman, edd—*Coriolanus*, III, 1, 30
- 11053 *No Wind of Blame*—G. Heyer—*Hamlet*, IV, vii, 57
- 11054 *Tides in the Affairs of Men*.—E. L. Smith—*Julius Caesar*, IV, 111, 218
11055. *Sufferance Is the Badge*—A. L. Sachar—*The Merchant*, I, 111, 111

BRETON, N.

- 11056 N. B. & *The Passions of the Spirit* (1599)—J. Robertson.—*HLQ*, 3, 69-75, Oct

CAMPION, THOMAS

- 11057 M. Kastendieck's *England's Musical Poet*—E. H. Fellowes—*RES*, 15, 99-101, Jan.

CHAPMAN, G.

- 11058 G. C.'s 'Fortune with winged hands.'—A. H. Gilbert—*MLN*, 54, 201, Mar
- 11059 The ethical bias of G. C.'s *Homer*. D. Smalley.—*SP*, 36, 169-91, Apr
- 11060 G. C. and Scapula.—G. C. Loane. *NQ*, 176, 405-06, June 10.
- 11061 The date of *Bussy d'Ambois*—R.

G. Howarth—*NQ*, 177, 25, July 8
See 11104, 11130.

COMEDY

- 11062 *Masters of Dramatic Comedy & Their Social Themes*—H. T. E. Perry. Harvard UP, pp. xxii + 428, bib
- 11063 When Elizabethans laughed—W. V. O'Connor.—*SAB*, 14, 243-47, Oct.
- 11064 *In Praise of Comedy. A Study in Theory & Practice*.—J. Feibleman.—*N. Y. Macmillan*, pp. 284
See 11092, 11141.

COMMENTARY

- 11065 Three ways to Sh.—B. T. Spencer. *Sewanee R*, 47, 119-29, Jan.
- 11066 A note on pessimism in the Renaissance.—A. L. Williams—*SP*, 36, 243-46, Apr
- 11067 Sh. forbears.—E. E. Stoll—*MLN*, 54, 332-39, May.
11068. Recent Eliz'n criticism.—E. E. Stoll—*ELH*, 6, 39-57, Mar.
11069. H. B. Charlton's *Shakespeare's Comedy*—V. Bohet, *Engl. Studies*, 21, 20-23, Feb.
—W. Schmidt, *Beiblatt*, 50, 104-06, Apr
- 11070 Many Shakespeares.—*TLS*, Feb. 25, p. 121.
- 11071 Poetry & Freedom.—*TLS*, Jan. 21, p. 41
11072. *Approach to Sh.*—D. A. Traversi—*Ln. Sands (The Paladin P)*, pp. 152.
11073. P. Alexander's *Sh's Life & Art*—*TLS*, Feb. 25, p. 122—*Baconiana*, 24, 93-100, Apr.
- 11074 *What about Sh.*—D. Hardman—*Ln. Nelson*, 2s.
- 11075 *Sh.*—M. Van Doren.—*N. Y. : H. Holt & Co.*, pp. viii, 344, \$3
- 11076 The mirror concept and its relation to the drama of the Renaissance.—R. L. Anderson.—*Northwest Missouri State Teachers College Studies*, vol. 3, pp. 30

11077. Falstaff's Robin & other pages.—J W. Draper.—SP, 36: 476-90, July.
11078. The age of Sh's characters.—'Peregrinus,' *et al.*—NQ, 177: 83 (July 29), 123 (Aug. 12).
11079. Time & fortune.—S. C. Chew.—ELH, 6 83-113, June.
11080. *Die Zeitgenossen u unmittelbaren Nachfolger Sh's in d engl Kritik des 19 Jhs.* (Diss.) —E. Stolle—Hamburg, 1938, pp. 58.
11081. Universalité de Sh.—R. Lalou—Europe, 17 34-40, May 15.
11082. A speech about Sh.—I. Turgenev.—International Literature, June, pp. 47-49.
11083. Sh a contemporary of eternity.—T. Rokotov —International Literature, June, pp. 38-46, 10 pls.
11084. Sh & Bacon's essay 'Of love'—Baconiana, 24: 70-76, Apr.
11085. W. Scott & Sh compared.—J. C. Smith—Essays & Studies by Members of the Engl Ass'n, 24: 114-31.
11086. Sh & the doctrine of cosmic identities.—D. C. Allen.—SAB, 14: 182-89, July.
11087. The age of Sh's characters.—M. H. Dodds.—NQ, 177: 197, Sept. 9
11088. Absent thee from felicity. [Swift & Sh compared].—W. B. Watkins—Southern R, 5: 346-65, Sept.
11089. Notes on Sh.—W L. Phelps—Proc of the Amer Philosoph Soc., 81: 573-79, Sept. 25.
11090. Sh's mouthpieces.—E. R. Hunter.—Sewanee R, 47. 406-23, July.
11091. Comments on Sh.—W. Frank—*The Bridegroom Comes*, pp. 386-96.
11092. Patterns in Sh.—R. S. Knox—U of Toronto Q, 9: 107-16, Oct.
11093. The secret of Sh's power.—M. Van Doren—Catholic World, 150: 225-26, Nov.
11094. Van Doren's book on Sh.—W. H. Auden.—Nation, 149: 444-45, Oct. 21.
11095. *Dramatic Cynicism*—S R Littlewood—Ln I Pitman, pp. viii + 324, port (Sh, pp 129-70).
11096. *The March of Literature*.—F. M. Ford—Ln Allen & Unwin, 16s.—T.S., Dec 9, p 716
- See 11062, 11104

CONTEMPORARIES

11097. Melbancke & S. Gosson.—D. C. Allen—MLN, 54: 111-14, Feb.
11098. G. Sandys, poet-adventurer.—R. B. Davis—Americana, 33: 180-95, port, Apr.
11099. The identity of Geo Wilkins.—G B Dickson.—SAB, 14: 195-208, Oct.

CONTEMPORARY DRAMA

11100. Eliz'n 'fustian'—E G Clark—SAB, 14 57-59, Jan.
11101. A 16th-century Plough Monday play cast—F. T. Bowers.—RES, 15: 192-94, Apr.
11102. Influence of the masque on English drama, 1608-10. [Abstr. of Diss.].—A M. McAnally—U. of Oklahoma B (Jan), p 114.
11103. *Eliz'n & Jacobean Playwrights*.—H W. Wells—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp xiv, 328
11104. *The Baroque Character of the Eliz'n Tragic Hero*.—L L. Schucking—N Y: OUP, pp 29, 60c.
11105. A. Nicoll's *Stuart Masques & the Renaissance Stage*.—P. Meissner.—ES, 73 275-79, May
11106. R. Hill's list of early plays in manuscript.—J. Q. Adams.—Library, 20: 71-99, June, facs.
11107. R. Cawley's *The Voyagers & Eliz'n Drama*.—P. Meissner; Bieblatt, 50 110-12, Apr.—A: Walker; RES, 15: 475-76, Oct.

- 11108 *The Invisible World: A Study of Pneumatology in Eliz'n Drama*—R. H. West—Athens, Ga., pp xviii, 276, bib. (U of Ga P.)
See 11076.

CONTEMPORARY POETRY

11109. *'The Mirror for Magistrates.'*—A. L. Rowse—TLS, Apr 15, p 217.
11110 Poetry of the recusant Catholics.—TLS, Apr 1, pp 188 & 190, facs
11111 *Recusant Poets.* (With Selections) L I Guiney.—Ln. Sheed & Ward, pp xvi, 420; \$6.
11112 L C John's *The Eliz'n Sonnet Sequences*—K Tillotson—RES, 15 348-50, July.
11113 The octosyllabic couplet.—E. N. S Thompson—PQ, 18 257-68, July.
11114 The sonnets in *Tottel's Miscellany*.—W. R. Parker—PMLA, 54 669-77, Sept
11115. *'Theatre for Worldlings,'* by J. Van der Noot.—Facs. text; [With an introd'n].—L S. Friedland, ed.—N Y: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (100 W. 31st St.), pp xxii, [274], ils.; \$5. (Bibliographical note by W A Jackson).
11116 *'The Golden Aphrodisii' & Grange's Garden'* by J. Grange. [Facs text, With an introd'n]—H. E. Rollins, ed.—N Y Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, pp. x, [144].
11117 Classical material in broadside ballads, 1550-1625—H C Baker—PMLA, 54 981-89, Dec.

CONTEMPORARY PROSE

11118. The Engl jestbooks of the 16th & 17th centuries.—F P. Wilson—HLQ, 2 121-58, Jan.
11119. S Guazzo & the *Emblemata* of A. Alciati—J L Lievsay—PQ, 18: 204-10, Apr
See 11116.

CUSTOMS

- 11120 *Old Engl Customs & Ceremonies.* F J. Drake-Carnell—N. Y.: Ch. Scribner's Sons, pp 120, ils; \$3.

D'AVENANT, WILLIAM

- 11121 A. H. Nethercot's *Sir Wm. D.*—A K McIlwraith—RES, 15: 353-56, July

DAVIES, JOHN

- 11122 The polemical uses of . . . *Nosce Terpsum*.—R H. Perkinson—SP, 36: 597-608, Oct.

DEKKER, THOMAS

11123. D's early work for the theatre: a study of his technique & collaboration.—W. L. Halstead—Abstr. of Dissertations (U of Southern Calif.), pp. 35-39.
11124. A note on *Old Fortunatus*.—W. L. Halstead—MLN, 54. 351-52, May.
11125. T. D's arrest by the Chamberlain's men—W. L. Halstead—NQ, 176: 41-42, Jan 21.
11126 *T. D: A Concise Bibliography.*—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y.: The Author, pp. viii, 46 (With a bibliography of T. Heywood, \$4.25).
11127. Burial place of T. D.—M. Eccles.—NQ, 177: 157, Aug 26.
11128. On the text of *The Famous History of Sir Th. Wyatt*.—W. L. Halstead.—MLN, 54: 585-89, Dec.
11129. Collaboration on *Patient Grissill*.—W. L. Halstead—P Q, 18: 381-94, Oct.
11130. Another fragment of Henslowe's diary—J. Q. Adams.—Library, 20: 154-58, Sept., 2 facss.
See 11198.

DONNE, JOHN

- 11131 *Studies in Metaphysical Poetry: Two Essays & a Bibliography*—T Spencer & M Van Doelen—N Y CUP, pp. iv, 88, \$1.50
- 11132 J D & E Gilpin—R E Bennett—RES, 15 66-72, Jan.
- 11133 A comparative study of J D & T S Eliot [Absti of Diss]—A M Sibley—U of Oklahoma B (an), p 116.
- 11134 D's 'Farewell to love.'—G Williamson—MP, 36 301-03, Feb
- 11135 An interpretation of J. D's 10th elegy—F. T Bowers—MLN, 54 280-82, Apr
- 11136 'Farewell to love'—A M. Coon—TLS, Aug. 12, p. 479
- 11137 J D's disdain—TLS, Aug 26, p 502.
11138. 'Farewell to love.'—C Bell—TLS, July 1, p 389
- 11139 *D's Imagery A Study in Creative Sources*—M A. Rugoff—N Y Corporate P (163 Front St), pp 272, \$2.50—R Metz, ES, 73 397-401, Oct

See 11221

DRAMA

- 11140 Drama—C S Baldwin—*Renaissance Literary Theory & Practice*, pp 133-54.
- 11141 Komödie u Tragödie—W Mueller—Neue Rundschau, Nov., pp. 398-400.
- See 11095

DRAYTON, MICHAEL

11142. M. D and Richard II. 1597-1600—K Tillotson—RES, 15 172-79, Apr
- 11143 D. as a 'historian' in the *Legend of Cromwell*—K Tillotson—MLR, 34: 186-200, Apr
- 11144 M D's first revision of his son-

nets—F Y St Clair—SP, 36 10-59, Jan.

- 11145 'Moly' in M D & in Milton—S R Watson—NQ, 176 241, Apr 8
- 11146 M. D & *Edward III*—H W Cundell, K Tillotson—NQ, 176 258-60 (Apr 15), 318-19 (May 6), 356 57 (May 20)

D'URFEY, THOMAS

- 11147 T D & the graveyard.—W L Ustick—MP, 36 303-06, Feb.

EDITORS, EDITING

- 11148 McKelrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxf Sb*—TLS, May 27, p 315.
- 11149 The Limited Editions Club's ed'n of Sh—E L Tinker—N Y Times Book R, Sept 24, p. 24.
- 11150 E Malone—D. N Smith—HLQ, 3 23-36, Oct

EDUCATION

- 11151 C Hollybriand, an Eliz'n schoolmaster—W B. Austin—NQ, 177 237-40 (Sept 30), 255-58 (Oct. 7)

ELIZABETH, QUEEN

- 11152 *England's Eliza.*—E C Wilson.—HUP, pp xii, 480, bib, 15 ils, \$5.
- 11153 *Elizabeth & Leicester.*—F Chamberlain—N Y Dodd, Mead & Co, \$5
- See 11240

ENVIRONMENT

- 11154 *The Jacobean Age*—D Mathew. N Y Longmans, Green & Co, \$5 (Ln, 15s.)
- 11155 *Elizabethan England.*—F. B. Williams, Jr—Bn Museum of Fine Arts, pp 32 + 41 plates (16" x 12"), \$5.

- 11156 *The Eliz'n Journals*.—G. B. Harrison.—N. Y. Macmillan, \$4.50. (The 3 *Journals* in one vol.)
11157. *Eliz'n England*—D. Mills.—*Renaissance & Reformation Times* (N. Y., 1939), pp. 293-331, ils.
- 11158 *Through Eliz'n Eyes*.—J. D. Wilson.—Ln, 2s

ERASMUS

- 11159 E. u d Spanische Renaissance.—W. Krauss—Archiv, 175 76-89, Apr.
11160. The relation of E to the Reformation.—C. A. Nash—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 96: 51-66, Jan.
- 11161 Het standbeeld van E.—Erasmus, July, pp. 154-57.
- 11162 *Der Einfluss d Erasmus auf d engl Bildungs-idee*. (Diss.)—H. Exner.—Berlin, 1939, pp. 160.
11163. Erastianism & divine right.—E. A. Whitney.—HLQ, 1: 373-78, July.
11164. F. Meres & E.—H. C. Matthes.—*Anglia*, 63: 426-35, Aug

ETHICS

11165. Principles of ethical form in pre-Shn tragic literature.—H. Baker.—*Introduction to Tragedy*, pp. 180-220.

FICTIONISED

11166. *Unwillingly to School*. [A one-act play.].—V. I. Arlett.—*Sussex* [1938?] pp. 16; 1s.
11167. *You Never Can Tell* [A short story.].—I. A. R. Wylie.—*Herald-Tribune Books*, Apr. 16, p. 3.

FOLIOS

11168. Why the Bodleian's First Folio remained in England.—R. M. Smith.—*RES*, 15: 257-64, July.

FORD, JOHN

11169. J. F. & Platonic love in the court.—G. F. Sensabaugh.—*SP*, 36: 206-26, Apr.
11170. F's tragedy of love-melancholy.—G. F. Sensabaugh.—*ES*, 73: 212-19, May.
- 11171 Burton, Ford & *Andromana*.—S. B. Ewing, Jr.—*PMLA*, 54: 1007-17, Dec. See 11068.

FRANCE

11172. La fausse J: d'Arc.—J. Moura.—*Les Annales*, May 10, pp. 471-74.
11173. Sh & les peintres français.—J. L. Vaudoyer.—*Beaux-Arts*, Apr. 7, pp. 1 & 4, il.
11174. Sh in France.—*TLS*, Oct. 21, pp. 609 & 614.

GARRICK, DAVID

11175. E: Stein's *D. G.*—F. T. Wood.—*Engl Studies*, 21: 138-40 (June).—A. Nicoll; *JEGP*, 38: 462 (July).

GERMANY

11176. *Sh-Pflege auf d dt Bühne vom Ende d Weltkriegs*. (Diss.)—W. Stroedl.—Weimar, 1938, pp. 98, ils.—J. Albrecht; *Casopis pro Moderni Filologii*, 25: 365-68.
11177. Sh im Leben u im d Wissenschaft d neuen Deutschland.—W. Schmidt.—*Z f neusprachlichen Unterricht*, 38: 174-77, June 26.
11178. Sh Nordischer Mythos u christliche Metaphysik.—K. Schümmer.—*Hochland*, 36: 191-205, June.
11179. F. A. Voigt & W. A. Reichert's *Hauptmann u Sh*.—W. Preusler.—*Beiblatt*, 50: 119-21, Apr.
11180. Einleitung in d 'Sh-Manie'.—A. Bergmann.—*Jb d Grabbe-Gesellschaft*, 1: 25-29.

- 11181 *Sh: Personliches aus Welt u Werk.*
—R. Wollenberg.—Pp 138

11182. Die dt Sh-Gesellschaft.—W. Deetjen—Forschungen u Fortschritte, 15: 232-33

11183. The Influence of Wieland's & Eschenburg's Sh Translations on Schlegel's Versions [MS. Diss. in progress].—C. Lazenby—Johns Hopkins U.

- 11184 German translations of Sh. [MS. diss., in progress].—O. Jones.—Stanford U.

11185. Sh u d dt Leser.—H. Kroepelin.—Dt. Allg Ztg, no 229

GREENE, ROBERT

- 11186 Further repetitions in the works of R. G.—C. J Vincent—PQ, 18 73-77, Jan.

11187. Pettie & R. G.—C J Vincent—MLN, 54: 105-11, Feb.

11188. Characteristics of the novel as exemplified in G's pamphlets [Abstr. of Diss.].—E: I. Utterback.—U of Oklahoma B (Jan.), pp. 118-19

- 11189 A study in Eliz'n typography: a cipher in *The Spanish Masquerade*.—G. B. Curtis—Baconiana, 24: 6-21, Jan, 17 pll

11190. R. G. (*A Concise Bibliography*).—S. A. Tannenbaum—N. Y.: The Compiler, pp. viii, 58 (970 items); \$3.50.

11191. The literary origins of R. G.—T. H. McNeal—SAB, 14: 176-81, July.

11192. R. G. & 'Mr. Steeven Guazzo'.—J. L. Lievsay.—SP, 36: 577-96, Oct.

- 11192a. *A Looking Glasse & the Scriptures*—R. A. Law.—U of Texas Studies in English, pp. 31-47.

GREVILLE, F.

11193. *Poems & Dramas of F. G.* [With intr & notes].—G Bullough, ed—Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, pp. xii + 324, port & 4 facs. (Vol. 1).

HERBERT, G.

- 11194 Missing G. H. manuscripts.—F. E Hutchinson—TLS, July 15, p 421.

11195. A G. H query.—R F Rattray; TLS, June 24, p. 374.—J M. Murry; TLS, July 1, p. 390.—B. G. Brown; July 8, p 406

- 11196 *The Temple & The Christian Year.*—E. N. S. Thompson—PMLA, 54: 1018-25, Dec

HEYWOOD, THOMAS

- 11197 Wm. Painter & T. H.—D Bush.—MLN, 54. 279-80, Apr.

11198. *T. H: A Concise Bibliography.*—S A. Tannenbaum, comp—N. Y.: The author, pp vi, 44. (With a bibliography of T Dekker, \$4.25).
See 11111

HOOKE, R.

- 11199 Notes on H's prose.—D. C. Boughner—RES, 15: 194-200, Apr.

HUNGARY

- 11200 Sh in Hungary—A Yolland.—Hungarian Q, 5 285-96, July.

ICELAND

- 11201 *Sh á Islands.*—S Einarsson.—Winnip Viking P

INDIA

11202. C N. Menon's *Sh Criticism.*—Baconiana, 24: 43-46, Jan. A W. Pirkhofer; ES, 73 393-95, Oct

- 11203 Feudal manners in Sh.—M. M. Bhattacharyee.—Calcutta R, 70: 181-94, Feb.

11204. An Indian [C. Menon] on Sh.—S Rice—Asiatic R, 35: 123-29, Jan.

- 11205 Sh criticism through Indian eyes.—Y. D Bhawe—J of U of Bombay, 7: 196-98, Sept
See 11298

INFLUENCE

- 11206 Shelley & Sh—D. L. Clark.—PMLA, 54. 261-87, Mar.
11207 Sh's tyanny over Grillparzer.—H. Salinger.—Monatsheft f dt Unterricht, 31 222-29, May.

IRELAND, WM. H.

- 11208 *The Fourth Forger*.—J Mair.—N. Y. Macmillan, \$2.75—W. T. Hastings; Saturday R, June 24, p 16—W. T. Hastings, SAB, 14 248-51, Oct.

ITALY

- 11209 Machiavelli & Guicciardini.—F. Gilbert—J of the Warburg Institute, 2: 263-66, Jan
11210 Machiavelli u d politische Ethos.—W. A. Eicke.—Die neue Rundschau, June, pp. 608-11.
11211 *Accent on Power: The Life & Times of Machiavelli*.—V. Marcu. (R. Winston, tr.)—N. Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, pp. x, 314, \$3. T. C. Chubb, N. Y. Times Book R, Sept 17, p 6, 2 ils.
11212. The first knowledge of Machiavelli in Scotland.—J. Purves.—La Rinascente, 1. 139-42, Jan, 1938
11213. The ideas of Machiavelli.—G. Freyer.—Scrutiny, 8 11-31, June.
See 11062.

JAPAN

11214. Sh in Japan—A Thaler.—SAB, 14: 192, July.

JEWS

- 11215 The Jew in Engl drama.—E. D. Coleman.—B of the N. Y. Public Libr, 43 45-52 (Jan), 374-78 (Apr.).

- 11216 *The Jew in the Literature of England to the End of the 19th Century*.—M. F. Moddel.—Phila.: Jewish Publication Soc of America, pp. xvi + 436, bib, \$2.50.

JONSON, BEN

- 11217 B. J.—L. I. Guiney.—*Recusant Poets*
11218 J allusions in Restoration comedy. C. B. Graham.—RES, 15 200-04, Apr
11219 Vol. 6 of the new ed'n of *BJ*.—M. Praz.—Engl Studies, 21: 24-46, Feb.
11220. J's sanguine rival.—R. W. Short.—RES, 15 315-17, July.
11221 B. J. & J. Donne.—E. Simpson.—RES, 15. 274-82, July.
11222 B. J. allusions.—H. P. Vincent.—NQ, 177 26, July 8.
11223 Some Latin doggerel attributed to B. J.—T. O. Mabbott.—NQ, 176 422-24, June 17.
11224 B. J. and the Devil Tavern.—P. Simpson.—MLR, 34 367-73, July.
11225. B. J. & the hieroglyphics.—D. C. Allen.—PQ, 18: 290-300, July.
11226 Notes on B. J.'s English.—J. H. Neumann.—PMLA, 54. 736-63, Sept.
11227 B. J.'s sanguine rival.—P. Simpson.—RES, 15: 464-65, Oct.
11228 *B. J.: Selected Works* [With introd'n]—H. Levin, ed.—Ln: Nonesuch P, pp. xvi, 1010; 10s, 6 d.—E. Simpson, RES, 15: 477-78, Oct.
11229. B. J.—H. T. E. Perry.—Masters of Dramatic Comedy (Cambr), pp. 80-117
See 11076, 11104.

KYD, THOMAS

11230. *'Spanish Tragedy'*.—H. Baker.—*Induction to Tragedy* (Louisiana State U P), pp. 98-118.

11231. L. L. Schucking's *Die Zusätze z Sp. Tr.*—W. Fischer.—Beiblatt, 50: 115-18, Apr.

See 11076, 11104, 11111, 11311.

LANGUAGE

11232. 'The time' u 'time' bei Sh.—W. Azzalino.—Neuphilologische Monatsschr, 10: 96-109, Mar.

11233. Supernatural agents in Christian imagery: word studies in Eliz'n dramatists.—R. E. Saleski.—JEGP, 38: 431-39, July, tables.

11234. *Die Sprache Sh's in Vers u Prosa.* W. Franz.—Halle, ed'n 4 (rev.), pp. 730.

11235. English 17th-century dictionaries. G. E. Noyes.—PMLA, 54: 990-1006, Dec.

11236. The Southerners' 'you all'.—E. H. Long.—Southern Literary Messenger, 1: 652-55, Oct.

LODGE, THOMAS

11237. The source of L's *Reply to Gosson*. W. Ringler.—RES, 15: 164-71, Apr.
See 11111.

LONDON

11238. Thomas & Thomley's *The Great Chronicle of London* (1938).—Anon.—Quarterly R, 273: 61-73, July.

LYLY, JOHN

11239. G. W. Knight.—RES, 15: 146-63, Apr.

11240. J. L. & Q. Elizabeth.—W. B. Austin.—NQ, 176: 146-47, Mar. 4.

11241. The background of Tophas.—D. C. Boughner.—PMLA, 54: 967-73, Dec.

MARLOWE, C.

11242. C. M., Faustus, & S. Magus.—B. D. Brown.—PMLA, 54: 82-121, Mar.

11243. M's London.—C. Noiman.—TAM, 23: 291-300, Apr.

11244. 'D', *Faustus*.—J. Smith.—Scrutiny, 8: 36-55, June.

11245. The rectoi in D's *Faustus*.—G. W. Wolthuis.—Neophilologus, Oct., pp. 49-50.

11246. *The Devil to Pay* & the Faust legend.—U: Ellis-Fermor.—English (no. 2), 2: 383-86.

MARSTON, JOHN

11247. J. M.—H. T. E. Perry.—Masters of Dramatic Comedy & Their Social Themes (Cambr. Harvard U P), pp. 95-97.

See 11104, 11219.

MASSINGER, PHILIP

11248. *The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach*.—R. H. Ball.—Princeton U P, pp. xiv, 468; 14 ils, \$5.—P. Hutchinson; N. Y. Times Book R, Apr. 9, p. 27.

11249. P. M.—B. Maxwell.—*Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, & P. M.*, pp. 63-73, &c.

MERES, F.

11250. D. C. Allen's *F. Meres' Treatise 'Poetrie'*.—H. C. Matthes.—Beiblatt, 50: 72-79, Mar.

MIDDLETON, THOMAS

11251. R. C. Bald's ed'n of *Hengist*.—J. Murray.—RES, 15: 221-25, Apr.

11252. The sources of some incidents in M's London plays.—M. Fisher.—RES, 15: 283-93, July.

11253. Swinburne on T. M.—T. Larsen.—TLS, pp. 357-58, June 17.

11254. 'Swathie'.—F. Sullivan.—TLS, June 24, p. 373.

MISCELLANEA

11255. *Date 1601*. [With introduction, notes, bib].—M Twain. (F. J. Meine, ed).—Chicago. Angus Book Shop; \$6.
11256. Shn miscellany [*verse*].—'Sagittarius'.—New Statesman & Nation, 17: 319-20, Mar. 4.
11257. The Sh industry.—I. Brown.—Harper's M, 179. 97-104, June.
11258. This bardolatry business.—TLS, Apr. 8, p. 203.
11259. *Amazing Monument: A Short Hist of the Sh Industry*.—I Brown & G. Fearon.—Ln: W. Heineman, pp. xii + 332, 9 ils, 10s. 6d.—R. L. Eagle, Baconiana, 24: 156-57, July.
11260. Osler on Sh, Bacon, & Burton (With a reprint of Dr. Osler's 'Creators, Transmuters, & Transmitters').—W. White.—B. of the History of Medicine, 7: 392-408, Apr.
11261. H. Headley & the Eliz'n revival.—E. R. Wasserman.—SP, 36: 491-502, July.
11262. Brown & Fearon's *The Sh Industry*.—A. W. Porterfield.—N. Y. Evening Sun, Sept. 16, p. 25.
11263. Sh answers the scholars [*poem*].—C: L. Lanyon.—Poetry R, 30: 125, Mar.
11264. Stevenson & Sh.—E P. Vandiver, Jr.—SAB, 14: 232-38, Oct.
11265. Engl stones. [Teaching Sh.].—A. G. Alexander.—Peabody J of Education, 17: 35-41, July.

MONTAIGNE, M.

11266. M [*sonnet*].—L. R. Lind.—Sewanee R, 47: 151, Apr.
11267. Notes sur la bibliothèque de M.—A. Masson.—Humanisme & Renaissance, 6: 475-93, Oct.
11268. M.—C. S. Baldwin.—*Renaissance Literary Theory & Practice*, pp. 232-39.

11269. M's trip to Italy.—L. O. Forkey.—French R, 13: 122-28, Dec.

MUSIC

11270. Verdi & Sh.—D. Hussey.—Spectator, 162 997, June 9.
See 11276, 11369.

PEELE, GEORGE

11271. '*Old Wives' Tale*'.—H. Jenkins.—MLR, 34: 177-85, Apr.
11272. A Latin poem by G. P. (?).—T. Brooke.—HLQ, 3: 47-67, Oct, facs.

Antony & Cleopatra (A&C)

11273. W Traub's *Auffassung u Gestaltung d Cleopatra in d engl Literatur*.—W. Mann.—Beiblatt, 50: 201-02, July

As You Like It (AY)

11274. Jaques' 'seven ages' & Bartholomaeus Anglicus.—J. W. Draper.—MLN, 54: 273-76, Apr.
11275. Jaques & the antiquarian.—E. B. Stoll.—MLN, 54: 79-85, Feb.
11276. Sh's musical collaboration with Morley.—E. Brennecke, Jr.—PMLA, 54: 138-49, Mar.
11277. AY [With intr & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—Bn Ginn & Co., pp. xx + 206, 85c.
See 11016, 11078.

Comedy of Errors (Errors)

11278. *Errors* as a musical comedy.—E. R. Wyatt.—Catholic World, 148: 474-78, Jan.
11279. Weirdness in *Errors*.—G. R. Elliott.—U of Toronto Q, 9: 95-106, Oct.
11280. *Errors*. [Dutch translation].—J. W. F. W. Buning, tr.—De Gids, 103: 151-68 (Nov.), 249-85 (Dec.).

Coriolanus (Cor)

11281. *Cor* u wir.—H. Krieger.—Die neueren Sprachen, 47 131-47, Apr
11282. *Cor*: a study in Renaissance psychology.—J. W. Draper.—W. Va U B, 3 22-36, Sept.
11283. *Cor* produced by the U of Hawaii Theatre Guild [2 ils].—TAM, 23: 911, Dec.
- See 11435.

Hamlet (H)

11284. The new 2d-quoito facsimile.—R. B. McKerrow.—RES, 15: 96-97, Jan.—B. M.; Jan. PQ, 18:91
11285. Parrott & Craig's ed'n of *H*.—B. Maxwell—PQ, 18: 89-91, Jan.—W. W. Greg, RES, 15 208-13, Apr.—T. Pyles; MLN, 54: 205-07, Mar
11286. Two notes on *H*.—S A. Tannenbaum—SAB, 14: 62-64, Jan.
11287. *The Hamlet of Sh's Audience*—J. W. Draper—Durham. Duke UP, pp. xii, 254, \$3
11288. The courtiers in *H* and *The Wild Duck*—A. E. Zucker.—MLN, 54: 196-98, Mar.
11289. *H* u wir.—R. Huch.—Monatschr f d dt Geistesleben, Feb, pp. 100-03.
11290. *H* [verse].—D. Paulun.—Monatschr f d dt Geistesleben, Feb., p. 134.
11291. Un Hamlet noir.—W. Sachs (H: Claireau, tr.).—R de Paris, Feb. 15 (pp 739-69), Mar 1 (pp. 51-82), Mar 15 (pp. 336-73), Apr 1 (pp 619-51)
11292. The dumbshow.—E. M. W. Tillyard.—TLS, Apr 15, p 217
11293. J. W. Draper's *The Hamlet of Sh's Audience*.—L. L. Schücking—RES, 15: 350-51, July.
11294. D. J. McGinn's *Sh's Influence*.—A: Walker.—RES, 15: 351-53, July.
11295. Ophelia.—L. L.—NQ, 177: 81, July 29.
11296. Amleto in abiti moderni.—S d'Amico.—Nuova Antologia, 402 235-37, Mar. 16
11297. A compliment to P Sidney in *H*—D. E. Baughan—NQ, 177: 133-36, Aug. 19
11298. Evolution of Hamlet's personality.—M. Bhattacharjee.—Calcutta R, 70. 288-99, Mar
11299. Without the Prince.—J. Hampden. TLS, May 27, p 313.
11300. 'H'.—H. K. Fisher.—Life & Letters, 22 268-71, Aug.
11301. W. Heyn's *Hamlet, ich rufe Dich*—E. Weigelin.—Beiblatt, 50: 99-101, Apr
11302. The varieties of Style in *H*.—B. Groom—Essays & Studies by Members of the Engl Ass'n, 24: 42-63.
11303. *H* par J. Laforgue.—K. Haedens. La Nouvelle R Française, 27: 1065-66, June 1
11304. Hamlet & the mouse-trap—W. W. Lawrence—PMLA, 54: 709-35, Sept
11305. *Sh H*.—B. I. Payne.—Theatre Arts Monthly, 23 496-506, July, ils
11306. 'H'.—F. Haiker.—TLS, June 3, p 327.
11307. Ophelia's character.—M. H. Dodd.—NQ, 177: 212-13, Sept 16
11308. Das *H*-Problem heute.—H. Glunz. Die neueren Sprachen 47: 356-70 (Sept.), 394-405 (Oct.).
11309. End of the Lyceum.—D. McCarthy.—New Statesman & Nation, 18. 47-48, July 8
11310. Mistress Ophelia.—S. A. Tannenbaum—SAB, 14: 252-54, Oct.
11311. *H & The Span Trag. again*.—E. E. Stoll—MP, 37: 173-86, Nov.
11312. An emendation of III, ii, 396-97.—J. G. McManaway & W. B. V. Lennep. MLR, 34: 68-70, Jan.
11313. M. Evans's return to N. Y. in *H*.—B. Atkinson.—N Y Times, Dec. 3, p 35.

11314. The philosophic basis of Coleridge's *H* criticism—R. Morgan—ELH (1939, no. 4), 6 25, 6-70.

11315. *H* [With intr'n & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—Boston. Ginn & Co., pp xx + 334, 85c.

Henry IV (H4)

11316. R. W. Bond's *Studia Otiosa*.—V. de S. Pinto.—RES, 15 89-91, Jan.

11317. M. Evans's production of *1H4*.—B. Atkinson, N. Y. Times, Jan. 31, p. 17.—R. Lockridge, N. Y. Sun, Jan. 31, p. 12.—R. Watts, Jr., N. Y. Herald-Tribune, Jan. 31, p. 12.—S. B. Whipple, N. Y. World Telegram, Jan. 31, p. 8.—W. Waldorf, N. Y. Post, Jan. 31, p. 6.—R. Gulder, TAM, 23. 240

11318. A note on *2H4*—H. E. McCain. SAB, 14 51-54, Jan

11319. *M. Evans Presents 'H4'*—Anon.—N. Y. W. Kolmans (234 W. 44th St.), ils, 25c.

11320. Falstaff.—P. Messiaen.—R. des Cours & Conférences, Dec 15, 1938 (pp. 84-86), Jan. 15, 1939 (pp. 280-88).

11321. The reflective element in Falstaff.—S. A. Small.—SAB, 14 108-21 (Apr), 131-43 (July)

11322. Gilded twopences.—D. Allen.—British Numismatic J, 23 156.

11323. The text of *1H4*.—H. W. Crundell.—NQ, 177 347-49, Nov. 11.

11324. Falstaff u Don Quichotte.—H. Wyneken.—Münch. Neueste Nachr., no. 113.

See 11078.

Henry VIII (H8)

11325. *Queen Anne Boleyn: A Novel*.—F. Hackett.—N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co., \$2.75.—H. Gorman, N. Y. Times Book R, Sept. 24, p. 9.

Julius Caesar (JC)

11326. Has Cassius been misinterpreted?—D. Klein.—SAB, 14: 27-36, Jan.

11327. Sh's Casarbild.—W. Spiegelberger.—Neuphilol. Monatsschr. 10: 177-89, May

11328. Die Klassischen Quellen d. Antoniusrede.—E. Staedler.—Neuphilol. Monatsschr., 10 235-45, June.

11329. Line division in *JC*.—A. P. Rositer, TLS, July 29, pp. 453-54.—R. B. McKerrow, TLS, Aug. 19, p. 492.

11330. Reviewing *JC*.—H. Geoghegan.—Carnegie M., 13 57-59, May, il.

11331. Time spent on *JC*.—L. F. Weninger.—Carnegie M., 13: 86-90, June.

11332. *JC* [With intr'n & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—Bn. Ginn & Co., pp. xx + 210; 85c.

King Lear (KL)

11333. If Cordelia . . . (A fantasy on what might have been.)—P. F. v. Draat.—A, 63: 135-43, Jan.

11334. *Das Gestaltungsgesetz von 'KL'* (Diss.)—I. Gurland.—Würzburg, 1938, pp. 100.

11335. Pronunciation of 'daughter'.—W. W. Gail.—NQ, 177: 15, July 1.

11336. 'Is this the promis'd end?'—R. H. Perkinson.—Engl. Studien, 73: 202-11, May.

11337. Montaigne's *Apologie of R-Sabond* and *KL*.—W. B. D. Henderson.—SAB, 14: 209-25, Oct.

11338. '*KL*'.—A. Turel.—*Bachofen-Freud: Zur Emanzipation d. Mannes vom Reich d. Mutter* (Bern: H. Huber), pp. 61-74.

11339. 'Vex not his ghost'.—W. A. Rathkey.—English (no. 2), 2 355-61.

See 11427

Love's Labour's Lost (LLL)

11340. D. Garrick & an unknown operatic version of *LLL*.—G. W. Stone, Jr.—RES, 15 323-28, July.

11341. Bacon & freemasonry.—*Baconiana*, 24: 165-66, July.
See 11078.

Macbeth (M)

- 11342 Notes on M.—M. Flouman.—*Adelphi*, 15 238-42 (Feb), 287-91 (Mar.).
11343. D. *Tieck's 'M'-Uebersetzung*. (Diss.)—J. W. Winter.—Berlin, 1938, pp. 114
11344. M makes Ln children laugh.—C. Morgan.—*N. Y. Times* (Sec. 9, p. 2), June 4
11345. Macbeth and the Lady as criminal types.—A. Goll. (J. Moritzen, tr.).—*J of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 29: 645-67, Jan
11346. Lady Macbeth as a criminal type.—A. Goll. (J. Moritzen, tr.)—*Case & Comment*, 45: 5-11, July, 2 ils.
11347. 'How far is't to Forres?'—A. L. Strout.—*NQ*, 176: 330, May 13.
11348. A note on I, ii, 59-62.—P. Thorson.—*Engl Studies*, 21: 73-75, Apr.
11349. 'A summer's cloud.'—M. H. Dodds. *NQ*, 177: 212, Sept. 16.
11350. Macbeth & Milton's Satan.—E. E. Kellett.—*London Quarterly R*, 164: 289-99, July.
11351. Sh's 'M': *A Concise Bibliography*. [3,153 + items].—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—*N. Y. The compiler* (601 W. 113th St.), pp x + 166; \$7.
11352. Sh: script writer.—W. S. Milne.—*Canadian Forum*, 19 252, Nov.
11353. M. [With intr'n & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—*Bn: Ginn & Co.*, pp. xx + 254; 85c.
See 11067.

Merchant of Venice (MV)

11354. *MV*, 1939, in Brooklyn—J. G.—*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 10, p. 16.

11355. 'Red Wine & Rennish'—D. C. Boughner.—*SAB*, 14 46-50, Jan.
- 11356 The stage-history of *MV*. [Abstr of Diss.]—O. Smallwood—*U of Oklahoma B* (Jan), p. 117.
11357. Sh's Jew.—H. B. Charlton.—*The Disseminator*, 1: 13-14, Mar (Abstr fr *John Rylands B*, Jan 1934).
- 11358 Portia's judgment.—Lord Norman.—*U of Edinburgh J*, 10. 43-45, July
- 11359 Sh's Jew.—E. E. Stoll.—*U of Toronto Q*, 8 139-54, Jan.
11360. Shylock & Portia.—J. E. Hannigan.—*SAB*, 14. 169-75, July
- 11361 Shylock.—M. Beietz.—*Mass u Weit*, 2 504-16, Mai.

Merry Wives of Windsor (MW)

- 11362 'What the good-yere.'—W. A. Rook; *TLS*, June 17, p. 358.—F. W. P. Hicks; *TLS*, June 24, p. 373.
See 11078.

Mids. Night's Dream (MND)

11363. Punctuation poems.—R. H. Robins.—*RES*, 15: 206-07, Apr.
11364. *MND* in the hands of Garrick & Colman.—G. W. Stone, Jr.—*PMLA*, 54. 467-82, June.
11365. La psychologie dans [*MND*].—E. Legouis.—*Études Anglaises*, 3: 113-17, Apr
- 11366 [*MND*] thème astrologique.—Cambillard.—*Études Anglaises*, 3: 118-26, Apr.
- 11367 'Swinging' Sh's *Dream*: a musical variation by G. Seldes & E. Charell.—B. Atkinson.—*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 30, p. 24 (See other *N. Y. papers* of same date).

11368. *MND* [With intr'n & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—*Bn: Ginn & Co.*, pp xiv + 160; 85c.

Much Ado About Nothing (MA)

11369. *Five Songs (with Music) for 'MA.'*—Fr text by P Antokolskoi, music by T Khrenikov—Moscow, pp. 20.

Othello (O)

- 11370 What purgative?—A. R. Dunlap.—MLN, 54: 92-94, Feb.
11371. Le mystère de la perle & du judéen—L. Mandin—Mercure de France, 290: 257-92, Mar.
- 11372 The choleric Cassio.—J. W. Draper. B of the History of Medicine, 7: 583-93, June
- 11373 Iago, the criminal type.—A. Goll (J Moritzen, tr.)—J of Criminal Law & Criminology, 30: 35-51, May.
- 11374 Le mystère de la perte & du judéen—P Messiaen—Merc de France, 291: 237-43 (Apr.), 733-41 (May).
11375. Cassio's hopes—S A Tannenbaum—PQ, 18: 316-19, July.
- 11376 The jealousy of Iago.—J W. Draper.—Neophilologus, Oct, pp 50-60.
- 11377 The sagittary—R M Baine—SAB, 14: 226-31, Oct
- See 11067.

Poems

- 11378 H Rollin's ed'n of *The Poems*.—R. A. Law, MLN, 54: 138-40, Feb.—A. Thaler, JEGP, 38: 450-55, July
- 11379 *The Passionate Pilgrim* [Facs. text, with intr]—J. Q. Adams, ed.—N. Y.: Scribner's Sons (for the Trustees of Amheist College), pp lxxvi + [64], \$4.

Richard II (R2)

11380. R2.—J D. Wilson, ed.—N. Y.: Macmillan, \$2 25. (With introd'n, stage history, notes, glossary).

- 11381 The deposition of Richard II & the accession of Henry IV.—B. Wilkinson—Engl Historical R, 54: 215-39, Apr.

Richard III (R3)

- 11382 Richard III as the criminal type.—A Goll (J Moritzen, tr.)—J of Criminal Law & Criminology, 30: 22-35, May.
- 11383 H H Glunz's *Sh u Morus*.—W. Schmidt—Beiblatt, 50: 101-03, Apr.

Romeo & Juliet (R&J)

11384. Sh's 'star-crossed' lovers—J W. Draper—RES, 15: 16-34, Jan.
11385. R&J further restored.—N. B Allen—MLN, 54: 85-92, Feb.
- 11386 Romeo & Rosaline.—J W Cole. Neophilologus, 24: 285-89, July.
- 11387 'R&J'—M. Leaf.—American M, 128: 127, Dec.
- See 11078.

Sir Thomas Moore (STM)

- 11388 A clue [?] to the date of STM—R L Eagles—NQ, 177: 78, July 29
- 11389 Sh & STM.—H W. Crundell.—TLS, pp. 297-98, May 20.
- 11390 The date & authorship of STM—H W. Crundell—NQ, 177: 120-21, Aug. 12
- 11391 'STM'.—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 24: 164-65, July, 1939.
- 11392 'STM'.—R W Chambers.—TLS, June 3, p 327.

Sonnets

11393. W. Thomson's *The Sonnets of Wm. Sh. & Hy. Wriothesley*.—J. B. Leishman—RES, 15: 93-97, Jan.
11394. The repute of the *Sonnets* in the early 19th century.—G. Sanderlin.—MLN, 54: 462-66, June.

11395. The *Sonnets*—D. A. Traversi.—*Approach to Sh* (Ln. Sands), pp 39-48.
 11396. D Blay's *Sh's Sonnet-Sequence*.—K Tillotson.—RES, 15 346-48, July
 11397 *Sh's Sonette*. [A new translation].—G Wolff, tr.—Munchen, pp 164.

Taming of the Shrew (TS)

- 11398 H Burger's setting for TS.—TAM, 23: 266, Apr., ils.
 11399. Kate the cust.—J W. Draper.—J of Nervous & Mental Diseases, 6: 757-64, June

The Tempest (T)

11400. Was Sh a seaman?—N W G. Walker.—Baconiana, 24 124-28, July, 3 pll.
 11401 Three variants of the T as a theme in photography [3 ils]—TAM, 23: 112-13, Dec.
 11402 T [With intr. & notes].—G. L. Kittredge, ed.—Bn: Ginn & Co., pp xxii + 174, 85c.
 See 11087.

Timon of Athens

- 11403 An echo of the 'Paragone' in Sh.—A. B.—J. of the Warburg Institute, 2: 260-62, Jan.
 11404. On the authorship of V, iii.—P. H. Kocher.—SAB, 14: 239-42, Oct.

Titus Andronicus (Titus)

11405. 'Titus'.—H. Baker.—*Induction to Tragedy* (Louisiana State U P), pp. 119-39.

Troilus & Cressida (T&C)

11406. *Comical Satyre & Sh's T&C*.—O. J. Campbell.—San Marino: Huntington Libr., pp. x, 246; \$3.

- 11407 The wallet of oblivion.—D. T. Starnes.—NQ, 176 29-30, Jan 14.
 11408 Sh facsimiles.—T. W Baldwin.—TLS, May 6, p 265
 11409 Die Wortlehre in T&C.—W. Schmidt.—Die neueren Sprachen, 47. 81-88, May

Twelfth Night (TN)

- 11410 'Patience on a monument.'—T P. Armstrong.—NQ, 176: 10-11, Jan 7.
 11411 'The Lady of the Strachy'.—H. K. Baker.—NQ, 176 11-12, Jan 7.
 11412 TN in Ln.—A Dukes.—TAM, 23 99-100, Feb.
 11413 Morley and 'O mistress mine' (A reply to E Orennecke)—J. R Moore.—PMLA, 54 149-52, Mar
 11414. 'The Lady of the Strachy'.—W. H. Welply, Rockingham.—NQ, 176: 48 (Jan 21), 249 (Apr 8).
 See 11276

Two Gentlemen of Verona (TGV)

11415. A Broke's *Romeus & Juliet* a source for the Valentine-Silvia plot.—M: S. Allen.—Studies in Engl (U of Texas, 1938), pp. 25-46.
 11416. Sh in Verona & Poitiers.—Baconiana, 24: 151-54, July.
 11416a *The New Cambr. Sh & TGV*.—S A Tannenbaum.—N. Y.: The Tenny P (100 W. 31st St), pp. 68; \$1.

Two Noble Kinsmen (TNK)

11417. 'TNK'.—T Spencer.—MP, 36: 255-76, Feb.

The Winter's Tale

- 11418 A biography of Autolycus.—C: White.—SAB, 14: 158-68, July.
 See 11087.

POETICS

- 11419 *The Poet's Work*.—J. Holmes.—N Y.: OUP; \$2
11420. Le mystère poétique.—P. Trahard.—R des Cours & Conférences, Dec 30, 1938 (pp 152-62), Jan 15, 1939 (pp. 219-29), Jan 30 (pp 341-53), Feb. 15 (pp 442-55), Mar. 15 (pp. 658-72)
- 11421 *Poetry for Pleasure*.—A Fox.—Oxf, 2s—TLS, Mar 11, p. 149.
- 11422 Style & the man in poetry—TLS, Apr. 29, pp. 248-49.
11423. Poetry & the public world.—A. MacLeish.—The Atlantic, 163: 823-30, June
- 11424 *The Poet's Defence*.—J Bronowski—N Y.. Cambr UP, pp. vi, 258; \$2 50.—NQ, 176 359-60, May 20.
11425. *The Personal Heresy*.—E M. W Tillyard & C. S Lewis.—N. Y.: OUP, pp viii, 150, \$2.
- 11426 Die Kunst d Sonettes O. Klein-schmidt.—Zeitsch f Deutschkunde, 53: 241-46, Apr.
11427. Dramatic poetry & values.—H. A. Myers.—English J, 28: 356-64, May
11428. *Poetry & the Ordinary Reader*—M. R. Ridley.—N. Y.: E. P Dutton & Co., \$1.50
11429. Poetry & criticism—D. Jackson.—Adelphi, 15 547-50, Aug. 1.
- 11430 Einiges u lyrische Formen.—J. Weinheber.—Zeitsch f Deutschkunde, 53: 1-5, Jan
11431. Poetry & Modernism—M. Smith—Poetry R, 30 249-53, May.
11432. Poetry & modernism—D. M. Paulin.—Poetry R, 30 170-72, Mar.
11433. Poetry & modernism—J A Chapman—Poetry R, 30: 172-74, Mar.
11434. A theory of poetry.—M. Edgelow. Poetry R, 30 381-84, Sept.
11435. Poetry & politics.—C. H. Salter.—Poetry R, 30. 345-61, Sept
- 11436 The frontiers of poetry.—M. Smith—Poetry R, 30 297-307, July.
11437. *Renaissance Literary Theory & practice (1400-1600)*—C. S. Baldwin. D. L. Clark, ed.)—N Y.: Columbia UP, pp. xiv + 252, \$2.75
- 11438 The spiritual value of poetry.—D. H Steward—Theosophist, 60 563-65, Sept
- 11440 On poetry—R Bain—Poet Lore, 45 307-25.
- 11440 Ursprung der Poesie.—Literatur, 42 12-17, Oct.
11441. *The Burning Oracle: Studies in the Poetry of Action*.—G. W. Knight.—Oxf UP—TLS, Sept. 2, p. 514.
11442. Engl pastoral poetry.—J. E Con-gleton—Sewanee R, 47 450-57, July.
11443. *Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung (Vol I: Werk & Dichter)*.—J. Petersen—B, pp. xvi + 516
11444. Poetry, real & modern.—M. C Stopes—English, 2: 375-83.
See 11095, 11250.

POLITICS

- 11445 Sh's Staat—H. H Glunz.—Forschungen u Fortschritte, 15: 6-7.

PORTRAITS

11446. Sh's portraits.—C. W. Barrell.—N Y. Times, Dec 24, sec. 4, p. 9.

PREDECESSORS

11447. J. Heywood & Ric. Stonley.—K W. Cameron.—SAB, 14: 55-56, Jan.
11448. 'Gorboduc.'—H. Baker.—*Induc-tion to Tragedy*, pp. 9-47, &c.
11449. The relation of *Gorboduc* to the Senecan tragedies. [Abstr of Diss].—M: Barnes.—U of Oklahoma B (Jan.), pp. 111-12.

TRAGEDY

11502 *Induction to Tragedy*—H Baker
—Louisiana State UP, pp x, 248; \$2.75

11503 *Tragedy & the infinite*—T. E
Casson—Poetry R, 30: 265-75 (July),
363-70 (Sept.).

See 11063, 11141.

TRANSLATIONS

11504. R. Thiel's *O. Gildemeister als*
Uebersetzer engl Dichtungen.—A Glos.
—Beiblatt, 50: 122-24, Apr

VERSE

11505. *The Prosody of the Tudor Inter-*
lude.—J. E Bernard, Jr.—New Haven
Yll P, pp. xii, 228, \$3

11506 Sh's verse (condensed for stu-
dents).—S. A Tannenbaum—SAB, 14
60-61, Jan.

11507. Formation of the heroic medium
—H. Baker—*Induction to Tragedy*, pp
48-105.

See 11113, 11443.

WEBSTER, JOHN

11508. W's debt to Guazzo—M. L. An-
derson—SP, 36 192-205, Apr
See 11104, 11128.

WOMEN

11509 Women & love as Sh saw them—
V T McCormick—Catholic World,
150 330-34, Dec.
See 10994

WORKS

11510. *The Mercury Sh.* [Adaptations]
—O. Welles & R. Hill, edd.—N. Y (In-
cludes *MV*, *JC*, *TN*).

11511 *As You Like It, The Tempest,*
Jul Caesar, Macbeth, Hamlet, A Mid-
Nr's Dream—G L Kittredge, ed—Bn
Ginn & Co, 7 vols; 85c each—W T
Hastings, Saturday R, Aug. 19, p 13,
port

11512 *The Plays of Wm Sh [Measure*
for Measure, Mid's Nr's Dream, Hamlet
Errors, Othello, Coriolanus]—H. Far-
jeon, ed—N. Y.: Limited Editions Club,
6 vols, ils; \$5 each.

SHAKSPERE'S GULLS

By J. STEWART SCHELL

FOR a precursor of the gull as a type character in the dramas of Shakspeare and other Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights, one must look to the epigram literature of the 1590's. It was Sir John Davies who first completely limned the "gull" in *Epigrammes and Elegies*, which was written sometime between 1590 and 1598, probably about the middle of the decade. Next, writing in 1598, Edward Guilpin, in *Skialetheia*, added his conceit of "What a Gull is."

The word "gull" had an earlier use as a substantive, meaning a dupe, simpleton, fool, noddy, credulous person, but Davies added the virtuoso touch and first gave the gull a typical aspect, eminently fitting him for adoption by the dramatists of the nineties who were concerned with the comedy of humours and the satiric treatment of character.

After reading the following reproductions of the definitions of Davies and Guilpin, we shall observe how William Shakspeare joined George Chapman and Ben Jonson in making effective dramatic use (in the case of Shakspeare in a well-marked functional manner) of this new type character.

In Epigram 2 of *Epigrammes and Elegies*, Davies wrote:

OF A GULL

Oft in my laughing rimes I name a gull
But this new terme will many questions breede;
Therefore at first I will expresse at full
Vwho is a true and perfect gull indeede.

A gull is he who feares a veluet gowne,
And when a wench is braue, dares not speake to her;
A gull is he which trauerseth the towne,
And is for marriage knowne a common wooer.

A gull is he, which while he prowdly weares
 A silver hilted rapier by his side,
 Indures the lies, and knockes about the eares,
 Whilst in his sheathe his sleeping sword doth bide.

A gull is he which weares good hansome cloathes,
 And stands in presence stroking up his haire,
 And filles up his vnperfect speech with othes,
 But speakes not one wise word throughout the yeare:
 But to define a gull in termes precise,
 A gull is he which seemes, and is not wise.¹

Edward Guilpin, writing in 1598, gives an additional portrait of the gull in Epigram 20 of *Skialetheia; or, A Shadowe of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*. This satirist, it will be noted, gives credit for the earlier definition to Davies:

TO CANDIDUS

Friend *Candidus*, thou often doost demanda,
 What humours men by gulling vnderstand:
 Our *English Marshall* hath full pleasantly,
 In his close nips, describde a gull to thee:
 I'le follow him, and set downe my conceit
 VVhat a gull is: oh word of much receit!
 He is a gull, whose indiscretion,
 Cracks his purse strings to be in fashion;
 He is a gull, who is long in taking roote
 In barraine soyle, where can be but small fruite:
 He is a gull, who runnes himselfe in debt,
 For twelue dayes wonder, hoping so to get;
 He is a gull, whose conscience is a block,
 Not to take interest, but wastes his stock;
 He is a gull, who cannot haue a whore,
 But brags how much he spends vpon her score:
 He is a gull, that for commoditie
 Pays tenne times ten, and sells the same for three:
 He is a gull, who passing finicall,
 Peiseth each word to be thetorical:
 And to conclude, who selfe conceitedly,
 Thinkes al men guls, ther's none more gull then he.²

The first gull of Shakspeare's delineation appears in the person of Thurio, in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, written at some time between 1591 and 1595. Thurio palpably lacks the foppishness and fatuous oaths of the simpletons

that Davies satirized, but a careful inventory indicates that in other *minutiae* Thurio follows, point for point, the gull type as it appears in dramatic presentations.

Like the gull pictured in Davies' epigram, Thurio is typical in his pretension to wit. Having engaged in word-combat with Valentine, Thurio egregiously proclaims himself the victor.

In common with Slender in *The Merry Wives*, Labesha in Chapman's *An Humourous Day's Mirth*, and Cokes in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (to mention only a few examples), Thurio is the father's foolish choice for the hand of his unwilling daughter. Here Shakspeare is at one with his fellow dramatists.

Of what Katherine E. Jessup has called the "witless-wordless lover type," Thurio is a notable representative, for he is almost totally inept.

Consistently with the gull type, Thurio writes "wailful sonnets." When Proteus advises the wooing of the unresponsive Silvia by this means, Thurio agrees, as he has a sonnet "that will serve the turn." Versifying upon a strictly neophyte basis is characteristic of the gull in the drama. Stephen, Matthew, and Sir John Daw are Jonsonian figures who are devoted to rime, as are the gulls of *Cynthia's Revels*. The propensities of Slender, in *The Merry Wives*, will receive subsequent consideration.

Equally indicative of the gull is Thurio's pride in his person. He decides to wear a boot to make his leg "somewhat rounder." Also he is concerned about what Silvia thinks of his face. This trait is found in many simpletons of the dramatists' creation.

Not mentioned by either Davies or Guilpin is the foolish ancestral pride of many of the boobies. In a satirical aside, one of the characters in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* refers to Thurio as deriv'd "from a gentleman to a fool." In Field's play, *A Woman is a Weathercock*, Sir Abraham

Ninny most prominently displays this foible. Shakspeare's Sir Abraham Slender will be seen later to be similarly inclined.

Davies especially satirized the cowardice of the booby, and Thurio fits this specification. It will be recalled that when Valentine threatens the gull with instant death Thurio replies:

I hold him but a fool that will endanger
His body for a girl that loves him not.⁴

At the end of the play Thurio is contemptuously dismissed, consistent with the fate of so many of the gulls.

Thurio is not mere comic padding, for he has an integral part in the main plot of the play. We shall recur to the Bard's practice of using the gull in a vital way.

The Merry Wives of Windsor contains one of Shakspeare's most significant gulls in the character of Abraham Slender, whom we find, at the beginning of the play, defending the dignity of his cousin Shallow. At once we see the gull's inordinate pride in family, as he praises Shallow's ancestors.

In the first scene of the play Shakspeare makes a satirical thrust at his personal enemies, Justice William Gardiner and the latter's stepson William Wayte, in the characters Justice and Abraham Slender.⁵

Initially Slender is pictured as the candidate, willy nilly, of Cousin Shallow for the hand of Mistress Anne Page, who is also her father's choice for a union with Slender. The latter situation is conventional in portraiture of the gulls. In a scene with his fellow rascals, Falstaff confesses to Slender that he had broken the latter's head, at which Slender complains that he had been made drunk and had had his pocket picked by the cony-catching crew. Encouraged by Evans, Slender swears "by these gloves," "by this hat," and again "by these gloves," that his purse had been picked, and he makes the somewhat poignant remark, "I

am not altogether an ass." In this instance we recall the reference in the definition of Sir John Davies to the "othes" of the gulls. In this same scene Slender accuses various members of Falstaff's crew of having robbed him, but each of the accused in turn bullies the cowardly gull. The pre-Davies idea of the gull as the duped one is evident in Shakspeare's delineation.

When Master Page is alone with his three visitors, Slender, remembering his *Book of Songs and Sonnets*, asks his servant Simple if the book is not upon his person. To this query the foolish servant replies that the book had been lent to Alice Shortcake upon All-hallowmas last. The tendency of the gulls to make love through the instrumentality of verse has been commented upon in the discussion of Thurio. At the end of the scene Anne Page re-enters. She directs the gentlemen to the dining room, but Slender, dazzled, swears that he is not hungry. Shakspeare puts into the mouth of the gull the "forsooth's" which George Chapman had so well ridiculed in Labesha. Again we observe the "witless-wordless lover type." Protesting stupidly, "gentle Master Slender" is shooed to dinner by Mistress Anne.⁶ Shakspeare devotes much of the first scene of the play to the idiocy of Slender, who is of importance in setting the tone for this comedy whose prime purpose is to show John Falstaff in love.

Slender is characterized as the indifferent lover, encompassing the "unperfect speech" to which Davies made reference. The braggadocio air of the gull is pointed in a scene with Anne Page. Inquiring if any bears are loose in the town, Slender boasts:

That's meat and drink to me, now. 'I have seen Sackerson loose twenty times, and have taken him by the chain; but, I warrant you, the women have so cri'd and shriek'd at it, that it pass'd.

The braggadocio of the simpletons, a gift from the *miles gloriosus* type, while not mentioned by either Davies or Guilpin, runs through the entire line of gulls.⁷

The final discomfiture of Slender is accomplished when he finds "a great lubberly boy" awaiting him at Eton, where

he had planned to meet Mistress Anne Page. Though Shakspeare probably borrowed this latter device from Plautus's *Casina*, other Elizabethan dramatists likewise appropriated this strategem, to good effect.

The skillful manner in which Shakspeare has drawn Slender has long been recognized by commentators. William Hazlitt, for example, with characteristic vigor declares that this gull is "a very potent piece of imbecility . . . the only first-rate character in the play."⁸ Be this as it may, from first to last Slender has an important rôle in the development of the plot. He is not "filler," but a genuine motivating agency. Furthermore, as Slender has been shown indisputably to have been an attack upon William Wayte, the stepson of William Gardiner, "Shakespeare is here revealed for the first time as a master of personal satire, taking with devastating humour a satisfactory revenge for himself, his associates of the theatre, and Gardiner's victims in Southwark."⁹

In *Twelfth Night* the arresting form of Sir Andrew Aguecheek presents itself and proves upon subsequent examination to be one of the dramatist's most carefully delineated simpletons. Once more we find Shakspeare presenting the gull very early in the action of the play, and in *Twelfth Night* with unusual attention he prepares the entrance of the gull. In this instance a notable bit of character-drawing is accomplished. As William H. Fleming has pointed out, this exposition has a two-fold dramatic function, for it not only describes Sir Andrew and prepares for his entrance, but it also serves in graphic manner to characterize Sir Toby Belch and Maria early in the drama. There is involved the psychological principle that Toby's and Maria's opinions of the gull are indexes to their own natures.¹⁰

Before Sir Andrew enters, we know that Sir Toby has chosen him for his niece Olivia. He is described as "a prodigal," thus fitting him into a segment of the Guilpin definition. In addition, he is shown to be possessed of a quarrel-

some humour, but "he hath the gift of a coward to allay the gust."¹¹

When Shakspeare brings Sir Andrew upon the stage, the gull at once demonstrates that he has been accurately described. He is unable to understand the word "accost" and begins to parrot the exuberant Sir Toby. The customary deficiency in will to which the gull is subject is likewise shown.

Stock situations into which the gulls fit are exemplified in Sir Andrew's handsome clothes, his pretension to wisdom, his "unperfact speech," his oaths, his indifferent wooing, and his constant parroting of other characters. The "echo" tendency is prominent in pictures of the boobies.¹² Drawn on by Sir Toby, the gull issues a challenge, in letter form, to the "Count's youth!." This epistle is a masterpiece of stupid bravado. Presently Sir Andrew and the disguised Viola meet to engage in combat. They draw, but that is the extent of the action. Coward that he is, Sir Andrew declares: "I take the fault on me." But later, upon hearing Viola named a coward, Aguecheek recovers his courage and goes out to seek the supposed boy. Encountering Sebastian, who is Viola's brother and identical in appearance with her, Sir Andrew attacks him and receives a bloody coxcomb. Aguecheek offers to help the injured Sir Toby, who enters haltingly, but the latter replies: "Will you help?—an ass-head and a coxcomb and a knave, a thin-faced knave, a gull!" Olivia dismisses the crestfallen fool with the disdainful command, "Get him to bed, and let his hurt be look'd to."

Supplementing his comic function, the gull Andrew serves as a binding agent of plot elements. His mistaken attack upon Sebastian brings together brother and sister at the end of the play.

Hamlet contains one of Shakspeare's most encaustic treatments of the gull in the person of Osric. This character is upon the highest level of his type, as he is a courtier of some importance. Introduced initially in the final act, Osric comes

to Hamlet bringing a message from Claudius. Hamlet inquires of Horatio, "Dost know this water-fly?" Upon receiving a negative answer, Hamlet explains:

Thy state is the more gracious, for 't is a vice to know him.
He hath much land, and fertile, let a beast be lord of beasts, and
his crib shall stand at the King's mess. 'T is a chough, but as I
say, spacious in the possession of dirt.

Here we see the metamorphosis of country gull to court gull.

The complete witlessness of Osric is at once established in his voltefaces concerning the state of the weather. This situation is almost a replica of that in *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, in which Phantasmo, the court fool, has Osric's place. While Osric on several occasions serves as a messenger, he has a tendency to news mongering which is characteristic of not a few of the gulls. Shakspeare is scornful, in his treatment, of the foppishness of Osric, who is of the same *genre* as Fastidious Brisk in *Every Man out*.

Though Osric has been described as an episodic humour study and also as fulfilling a tragic relief function, Cumberland Clark appears to offer a more vital explanation. Throughout the play, by means of contrast, Shakspeare had been emphasizing "the refined tastes and intellectuality of Hamlet." All the witless characters—Polonius, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern—were dead when Osric was introduced. At the end of the play Shakspeare wished once more to contrast the deeply thoughtful Hamlet and the shallow proponents of Court life.¹³ The success of his effort is unmistakable.

Transferring our attention to *Othello*, we encounter Roderigo, who is listed in the *dramatis personae* as "a gulled gentleman." A study of this character reveals that he is a gull, not on the Davies-Guilpin model, but in the older meaning of a credulous, gullible person.

Roderigo appears in the first scene of the play, and at once we see that Iago controls his purse strings much as Sir Toby Belch, with perhaps better motives, had warded the

coffers of Slender. At the outset Roderigo demonstrates his puerile and credulous nature. Shakspeare, drawing his dramaturgy carefully, had significant reasons for the introduction, at an early point, of this choice fatuity. In the first place, an Elizabethan audience immediately recognized a fool, and the latter's early advent captured the fickle interest of the groundlings. Secondly, Shakspeare has succeeded, in the first scene of the play, in setting off the villainous character of Iago by presenting so vividly his tool, the simpleton Roderigo. This is a subtle stroke, and Shakspeare could probably have found no quicker way of fixing the character of "honest" Iago. In the gulling of the simpletons, the gullers usually may be detected, tongue-in-cheek; there is nothing of this in Shakspeare's handling of the situation, and this is but another instance of the dramatist's genius in taking a stock situation and altering it, to secure tremendous dramatic effect.

Throughout the action of the play, love-sick Roderigo is a useful tool for Iago. He shows the typical lack of wit and steadfastness of purpose marking the whole line of gulls. Egged on by the villain, the fool meets Cassio and is soundly cudged by the latter for his meddling. Beaten, and with his money almost spent, Roderigo is a pitiful spectacle.

Finally Roderigo agrees to a dual attempt to dispatch Cassio, and in the course of the last act he falls upon him, but is wounded. In the resultant confusion, Iago thrusts his sword into Roderigo, removing one more impediment to his desires. The gull dies before he can accuse Iago.

This is one of the few tragic treatments of the gull, and it again reveals Shakspeare employing this type character significantly.

Cloten, in *Cymbeline*, is a character that closely approaches the gull type and should therefore be considered in this paper. When he is introduced, at the beginning of Act II, through the frequent use of asides Shakspeare fixes his essentially foolish nature. His "little wit" is repeatedly

exemplified. As Cloten is the son of the Queen, it is necessary that most of the derisive comments be confined to asides. The assertions of Imogen, of course, furnish an exception. As soon as Cloten exits, a lord immediately exclaims:

That such a crafty devil as his mother
Should yield the world this ass!

In the scene of his introduction Cloten vigorously protests his right to utter oaths, and this element associates him with the typical gull. Guilpin, it will be recalled, brought to a close his epigram *To Candidus* with the following dictum:

And to conclude, who selfe conceitedly
Thinks al men guls, ther's none
More gull then he.

This particular is found in Cloten, for he refers to "foolish Imogen," and later groups her among the "fools."

In this play Cloten is to be observed in a council of war, in which his abilities, there revealed, place him above the ordinary gull in accomplishment. Finally Cloten fights with Guiderius, who enters with the former's head, declaring:

This Cloten was a fool, an empty purse;
There was no money in't. Not Hercules
Could have knock'd out his brains, for he had none.
Yet I not doing this, the fool had borne
My head as I do his.

Later the young victor reports that he has sent Cloten's "clotpoll" down the stream. "Clot-poll" in Shakspeare's day, it should be noted, had the meaning of a thick or "wooden head." (*N.E.D.*). As has been indicated, Cloten is a character of contradictory qualities, and certainly he is not among Shakspeare's better portraitures. In him we find the very unusual combination of villain and gull. In certain respects Cloten has gull-like dimensions, while in other distinguishing points he falls short of the mark. Recognizing his complex makeup, one may still, without undue trepidation, place him among the quasi-gulls.

In this examination of Shakspeare's gulls we have seen that in every case the simpleton has an integral structural func-

tion. Shakspeare was too great an artist to use the gull as comic "filler"; with an eminent degree of achievement he fits the gull into the dramatic structure, holding up the mirror to nature. There is not an "improbable" drawing of the gull in any of his plays.

In comparing the manner in which Ben Jonson and Shakspeare constructed their gulls, one finds that Jonson's gulls come as if from a fixed and often-used mold, while the gulls of Shakspeare, though they come from a mold, evidence the fact that the master draftsman is constantly altering the pattern. The "gentle" playwright was too keen a craftsman to ignore the typical cast of the gull, but the booby is not mere caricature; he is essentially lifelike. It is a paradox that though Jonson is the Realist and Shakspeare the Idealist, "in the deep and true sense the Idealist was the more real."¹⁴

Black-Foxe Military Institute Los Angeles, Calif.

¹I[ohn] D[avies] and C[hristopher] M[arlowe], *Epigrammes and Elegies* (At Middleborough, n. d.), A3^v.

²[Edward Guilpin], *Skialethera, or, A Shadowe of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres* (London: by J. R. James Roberts for Nicholas Ling, 1598), A 6, recto and verso.

³Katherine E. Jessup, "Shakespeare's Comic Lovers," *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, Vol. IV, No. 4 (October, 1929), p. 106.

⁴V, iv. This and other references to the Shakspeare text will be to William A. Neilson's *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, 3d Edition, 1910.

⁵Leslie Hotson, *Shakespeare versus Shallow*, pp. 109-110.

⁶The writer of the introduction to the Cambridge edition of *The Merry Wives* states that as a stage-direction following the first scene of the play he had written and later expunged: "He goes in, she follows with her apron spread, as if driving a goose."

⁷Cf. Gullio in *The Return from Parnassus*, Part I; Fastidious Brisk in *Every Man out*; Bubulcus in *Love Tricks*; Emulo in *Patient Grissil*.

⁸William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, 1817, first ed., p. 330.

⁹Leslie Hotson, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131.

¹⁰William H. Fleming, *Shakespeare's Plots*, 1901, pp. 329-30.

¹¹Cf. Matthew in *Every Man in*; Young Barnacle in *The Gamester*; Chough in *A Fair Quarrel*.

¹²Cf. Blaneul in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*; Balurdo in *Anonion and Balurdo*, Part I; Sogliardo in *Every Man out*; Simplicius Faber in *What You Will*.

¹³Cumberland Clark, *A Study of Hamlet*, 1926, p. 122.

¹⁴T. Fairman Ordish, *Shakespeare's London*, 1897, pp. 247.

A WARNING-PIECE AGAINST SHAKSPERE'S WOMEN

By ARTHUR M. SAMPLEY

IF I had a son, I should warn him against Shakspeare's women. I should want him to know them, yes; but to believe in them—that is another matter. I am quite sure that many a marriage has been spoiled because the husband read too much Shakspeare in his youth. Those who grow alarmed over the increase of the divorce rate should look into this matter. They talk much of the dangers of a mother-fixation in a young husband; I am sure that the Shakspeare heroine-fixation is equally dangerous.

The literary critics are wont to go into ecstasies over Shakspeare's heroines, and their attitude is at least understandable. Consider Juliet, Portia, Viola, Beatrice, Rosalind, Desdemona, Cordelia, and Imogen. Where will you find a like galaxy of feminine charm? They are lovely to look upon, loyal to the death, of unquestionable virtue, witty and sprightly, popular with old and young, and completely unspoiled. They are neither prigs nor wantons; they maintain the ideal balance. With a knowledge of the world and a rare ability to manage men, they are never indelicate in behavior; and if they are occasionally a little broad in their speech, their absolute chastity has made even the Victorians forgive them.

I should like this hypothetical son of mine to know a group of girls like these, but I should dislike him to believe in them too seriously. To do so might cause him to think that there is an inexhaustible supply of Portias and Rosalinds, that the pretty girl across the aisle in his history class has all the virtues of Cordelia, or that he has only to consult the telephone book to find another Juliet.

The plain fact of the matter is that there are no Rosalinds. The heroine of the forest of Arden is a sort of dream girl assembled from the virtues and beauties of a dozen maidens. They are virtuous girls enough; and beautiful girls, though

not abundant and in fact hardly adequate in quantity, are no great rarity. Sprightly maidens there are too—even witty ones. Poised, self-confident young ladies are not uncommon and the wholesome, unspoiled girl is still with us. Take any of Rosalind's excellent qualities, and I will find a girl who has it. But what I cannot find is a girl who has them all.

I do not maintain that no such girl exists. I am not such a cynic as crabbed John Donne, and would start off on the pilgrimage could I hear of such a paragon. But that she is so rare as to be negligible, I am quite sure. Most girls have the defects of their virtues. The beautiful girl is apt to be vain, the virtuous priggish, the self-confident maiden over-aggressive, the wholesome girl naive, and the clever one too often has a barbed tongue. The perfectly balanced character is, after all, beyond the perfection of nature.

Yet let us grant, for the sake of argument, that a Rosalind is a possibility in real life—a rare and happy accident. Still Shakspeare misleads us. In his plays the world seems full of such young ladies—equally attractive, equally perfect. It might seem to a young reader of Shakspeare that if he could not win a Rosalind, he might well hope to gain a Juliet, a Viola, or an Imogen. The landscape in Shakspeare is populated with charming heroines. Fops and villains like Claudio and Oliver get delightful wives, such as Hero and Celia, and a man cannot be shipwrecked on a desert island without coming upon a Miranda.

The danger to a young man in reading Shakspeare is thus twofold. He may believe that every attractive girl whom he sees is a potential Rosalind or Beatrice, in which case he is a fair mark for a designing, sophisticated girl, of whom there is a considerable proportion among the outwardly attractive. Or, if he avoids this obvious trap, he may fall into the more insidious error of expecting his wife to be another Portia. The first error will make only the man unhappy, but the second is equally unfortunate for the wife. Most women in the world make good wives—if the impossible is not expected of them. Some have a genius for home-making; some are charming hostesses; some are well-read

and clever companions. The average man certainly gets as good a wife as he deserves and, more often than not, a better. It is unfair, then, to the average girl to have a husband who expects her to be another Beatrice or Cordelia in addition to rearing children and planning menus. The wife whose husband wishes her to be like his mother has a minor problem compared to that of her whose husband expects her to be a replica of Juliet.

Shakspeare, indeed, seems constitutionally incapable of portraying a really bad woman in a convincing manner. Goneril and Regan are bad enough, but who really believes in them as human beings? The same criticism may be made of the Queen in *Cymbeline*. Lady Macbeth is, of course, an accomplice in murder, but she is none the less an ideal wife. A murderer could scarcely want a better. Even her crime is for her husband's sake. Cleopatra is a wanton, if you will, but a charming one. The portrayal of her character will not bring down the delinquency rate; more than one hard moralist has shed tears over her death.

Why should the greatest genius of English literature have presented so one-sided a view of women? He can hardly have believed in his heroines himself. We know little, it is true, concerning his relations with women, but what facts and traditions we do have hardly reveal Shakspeare as an ideally happy husband. That he visited his wife rarely during the period of his maturity seems highly probable, and the hints which we glean concerning his life in London indicate that his love-life was (at best) not conventional. There are the Manningham story of his assignation with a citizen's wife, the reference to an unsuccessful love affair in *Willobie His Avis*, the tradition about Sir William Davenant's parentage. Granting that all this is doubtful gossip, there are the sonnets to the Dark Lady in which a conviction of sin and a sense of moral revulsion mingle strangely with a powerful physical attraction. This too can perhaps be explained away, but all the evidence points in one direction. The women whom Shakspeare knew and loved were no paragons.

It has been suggested with some plausibility that Shak-

spere learned about women from Robert Greene, that ill-starred playwright and pamphleteer, whose posthumous work contained a bitter attack on his great successor. Certainly Greene's Dorothea, in *James IV*, is as loyal and patient a wife as any in the First Folio. Greene is in fact chiefly to be remembered for his ideal heroines—Margaret in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and a dozen or so equally gentle, uncomplaining women in his novels. Oddly enough, Greene, like Shakspeare, was no ideal husband. A wife-deserter, he associated with prostitutes and vagabonds and had an illegitimate child by the sister of a notorious criminal. This unhappy man, wasted with dissolution and tortured by conscience, died a wretched death of a surfeit of pickled herring, but not before he had portrayed some of the most charming women in all literature.

The irony in the characterization of ideal heroines by the rakehellly Greene and the amorist Shakspeare reminds us of the restless wanderer, John Howard Payne, who gave us the most poignant song of home. Many literary men put into their work the things which they have sought most and never succeeded in finding. Perhaps it was so with Shakspeare in his treatment of women. Throughout his life he pursued his ideal woman—that blend of virtue, wit, and loveliness—to find her only in the forest of Arden and on the island of Prospero.

Such a seeker of feminine perfection would in any age be doomed to disillusion. One has only to study Ben Jonson's women to see how vain, shallow, and sensual were many of the fine ladies of that age, and no matter how idealistic Shakspeare may have been, his keen insight into human nature must ultimately have revealed to him the truth. This consciousness of error must account, I think, for some of the railings against women and sex in the plays of the tragic period. As Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith has pointed out, the fulminations of Lear and Timon against the mere fact of sex are not only out of character; they reveal an abnormal, almost diseased, attitude of mind toward natural human relations.¹ Yet the same hand that wrote Lear's sadistic ranting against lechery portrayed the pure Cordelia.

It was in this so-called "tragic period" that Shakspeare wrote his only play which portrays a woman in a bitterly satirical spirit. Cressida—not Cleopatra—is the real wanton. Love with her is feline stalking, culminating in physical passion; she might easily be a portrait of "the dark lady." But Cressida stands alone in the plays of Shakspeare—the only unlikable woman who is at the same time real. Nor did Shakspeare build around her a successful play. Unpopular in its day, *Troilus and Cressida* is little read now. Sustained satire was hardly the forte of a creator of fairyland.

Shakspeare's portrayal of women was, then, very narrow in its scope; the charming heroine is almost his only type. It is true that in *Lady Hotspur* and in *Brutus' Portia* he gives us equally charming wives, but these are only *Rosalind* and *Juliet* grown a little older. *Lady Macbeth* has a more varied nature, and *Dame Quickly* is a masterpiece; but they are isolated figures, and *Lady Macbeth*, as I have already observed, is only a partial exception to the rule of perfection.

Not only does Shakspeare fail in portraying bad women; he fails too—and this is a more serious charge—in delineating the average woman, the one who is a mixture of good and evil. There are in Shakspeare no such characters as *Hardy's Bathsheba Everdene* and *Eustacia Vye*. These are the women whom a man needs to understand—creatures of good impulses, but wayward and uncertain, attractive to men but unable to judge them well, and most of all, uncertain of their own desires. How forthright is *Rosalind*, how devious is *Bathsheba*. How simple, for all her perfection, is *Portia*; how complex is *Eustacia Vye*. Of course, most women are neither *Bathshebas* nor *Rosalinds*, but the proportion of the former in the real world far outnumbers that of the latter.

Shakspeare has, indeed, imparted some of this waywardness of spirit to his heroines—but always in minor matters. *Juliet* reviles *Romeo* when she hears of *Tybalt's* death, and in the next breath damns the nurse for agreeing with her.

This is waywardness, of course, but it only serves to heighten by contrast the unswerving loyalty of Juliet. It is Rosalind who says, "I will weep for nothing like Diana in the fountain, and will do that when you are disposed to be merry; I will laugh like a hyen, and that when you are inclined to sleep." Here is waywardness truly, but neither Orlando nor we believe her. The frailty of Shakspere's heroines is all on the surface; they never make a real error of heart. It is perhaps this surface frailty that gives them the beguiling appearance of reality; they speak like women, but they behave like angels.

Shakspere's failure to portray women as they are is the more remarkable in that his men have the complexity of life.² Hamlet and Othello, Macbeth and Lear are compact of good and bad; they have the irresolution and the cross-currents of life in their veins. The more we know Hamlet, the less we understand him; he is as real and perplexing to us as our best friends. But we understand Portia and Rosalind; they have a finality which is beyond life.

Yet I cannot in the end wish these heroines any different. A forest of Arden without a Rosalind is a poor place for a vacation, and a world without a Portia and a Beatrice seems a dull and mundane sphere. The disbelief in perfection is, after all, a malady of old age, and no one of us willingly grows old. When I read Shakspere now, I seem to return to a younger world where every bride would stab herself over her husband's dead body, where every sweetheart would set out afoot to meet her lover in Arden, and where beautiful Portias gladly give away themselves and their fortunes to impecunious young men. I should warn my son against Shakspere's women—yes; but I should only bind his arms to the mast that he might more safely listen to the sirens sing.

*North Texas State Teachers College
Denton, Texas.*

¹*On Reading Shakespeare*, New York, 1933, p. 9.

²There is one exceptional instance of a wayward woman in Shakspere—Gertrude, who seems unable to decide between Claudius and Hamlet. Though a real figure, she can hardly be called a completely successful character, perhaps because we see her chiefly through Hamlet's eyes.

MONTAIGNE'S *APOLOGIE* AND *KING LEAR*

[*Concluded*]

By W. B. D. HENDERSON

FOLLY and Madness had begun to fuse into one complex experience in "Hamlet," where at the outset of his tragic period Shakspeare had announced through his hero that tragedy was the disruption and change of a great mind by subliminal forces, "oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason." Perhaps Montaigne helped frame even that concept. But if he did not, he surely confirmed it and gave it new suggestions that come into *King Lear*:

"... no eminent or glorious virtue, can be without some immoderate and irregular agitation" (282). "Dares not Philosophy thinke that men produce their greatest effects, and nearest approaching to divinity, when they are beside themselves, furious, and madde? We amende ourselves by the privation of reason, and by her dispooping. The two naturall waies, to enter the cabinet of the Gods, and there to foresee the course of the destinies" (will this become in the play "take upon us the mystery of things as though we were God's spies?") "are furie and sleep" (283).

Neither Lear nor Paphlagonia are candidates for such an experience. But Lear is made for it, with his Renaissance pride of reason, "the marks of sovereignty, knowledge and reason" (I, iv, 253), and dreads it most of all: "O, let me not be mad, not mad, sweet heaven": then, being moved that way, he prays "touch me with noble anger," and receives what he prays for and the sort of divine madness which Montaigne describes. Then, after the long storm of his mind, where gusts of folly mix with the grander strains of madness, he enters into the outer "cabinet of the Gods" where he sees values that his reason had ignored; and finally, after more storm, falls into that sleep from which he wakes to his purgation, and the paradisaal peace of reunion with Cordelia. All this is obvious, and hardly needs recording. But the subtler way in which Shakspeare has picked up into his complicated pattern a dozen rich threads of Montaigne's argument deserves to be shown clearly.

The "judgement" here concerns arrogant reason, and how it shall be disparaged. Montaigne, an elementary psychol-

ogist, says that it rests upon sense experience, which is without credibility. Such experience is different in different men: indeed, according to his setting and mood it varies in the same individual. For reference I list a few of the pertinent passages:

1. "A young childe heareth, seeth, and tasteth otherwise by natures ordinary rule, then a man of thirty yeares; and he otherwise then another of threescore" (320).
2. "Moreover, since the accidents of sicknesse, of madnesse, or of sleepe, make thinges appear other unto us, then they seeme unto the healthie . . ." (321).
3. "What we see and heare, being passionately transported by anger, we neither see nor heare it as it is" (316).
4. "Our senses are not onely altered, but many times dulled, by the passions of the mind. How many things see we, which we perceive not, if our mind be either busied or distracted elsewhere" (317).
5. "Therefore was it, that a worthy Philosopher pulled out his eyes, that so he might discharge his soule of the seducing and diverting he received by them, and the better and more freely apply himselfe unto Philosophy" (315).

The briefest reflection will show that the play abounds in illustrations of all these. It is a picture of variable value-judgments guided by sense. At the very start, Lear's love for Cordelia is altered to hate. Almost the same circumstance changes the mood of the King of France from what seems to have been coolness to passion; for him Cordelia becomes "most rich being poor, most choice forsaken, and most loved despised." The issue between Goneril and her father in some small part is that between a woman of, let us say in terms of the first quotation, thirty years, and a man not of three-, but of "four-score and upwards." Lear is aware of this last mentioned condition, and in the first days of his sojourn with her tries to put aside some affronts to his dignity as rather the suspicions of his own mind than intended slights. Goneril tells him roundly that "all's not offence that indiscretion finds and dotage terms so" (II, iv, 199-). On the heath, when the rain beats him, and Gloucester pities him for it, he replies (as Taylor also points out) in terms of the third and fourth passages:

. When the mind's free
 The body's delicate; the tempest in my mind
 Doth from my senses take all feeling else
 Save what beats there (III, iv, 11-).

Gloucester is no great philosopher: but though he does not pull out his eyes, like the truth-seeker of the fifth quotation, he has them pulled out for him with something of the same result:

I stumbled when I saw. Full oft 'tis seen,
 Our means secure us, and our mere defects
 Prove our commodities (IV, i, 19-).

Montaigne indeed might have given yet other help to this passage: "the weaknesse of our judgment, helps us more than our strength . . . and our blindness more than our cleare sighted eies" (201); and "it is not by our means" we reach final knowledge (238).

There are other examples of this sort of sense-value-judgment in the play, such as: "Wisdom and goodness to the vile seem vile" (IV, ii, 38): "woes by wrong imaginations lose the knowledge of themselves (vi, 290-); Lear practically confesses ague as affecting his judgment (I. 107), and it is generally allowed that his final belief that the feather stirs on Cordelia's lips follows a stroke of apoplexy. (I find myself a little ashamed to note that these two maladies, "if a continuall ague may in the end suppresse our mind," "if an Apoplexie doth altogether . . . extinguish the sight of our understanding," are exactly mentioned, 279). But, passing on, I cite but two more in this connection, for they seem to me to help us to see what most of all we wish to see, the sensitiveness to impressions, and the transforming power of Shakspeare's mind. Montaigne had climbed in the Alps and experienced vertigo in high places:

". . . and I could not without horror to my minde and trembling of legges and thighes endure to looke on those infinite precipices and steepy down-fals . . . Where I also noted, that how deepe soever the bottome were, if but a tree, a shrub, or any out-butting crag of a Rock presented it selfe unto our eyes . . . somewhat to uphold the sight, and divide the same, it doth somewhat ease and assure us from feare . . . And that we cannot with "some dread and

giddnesse in the head, so much as abide to looke upon one of those even and downe right precipices" . . . (Here follows the passage already quoted, about the philosopher who pulled out his own eyes. (315)

It seems likely that this is the actual experience behind that imaginary picture of Dover Cliff and equally imaginary vertigo which Edgar gives to his blinded father (IV, vi, 11-). There is a rock in the Paphlagonian story to suggest the scene: the old king wishes to cast himself down from it to his death and is prevented ("afflicted prince," *cf. K. L.*, V, iii, 5) by his son, but Shakspeare's additions are striking. The fanciful, of whom I am one, may even be let surmise whether Montaigne's shrub did not change into Edgar's samphire after a progress through the poet's mind, and that crag into purchase for his samphire gatherer. Montaigne, using this experience to prove how unstable the senses are, goes on to show how one sense sometimes tries to do the work of another when that is impaired, as Gloucester's sense of smell must do when he is bidden to use it to find his way to Dover (III, vii, 93-). Montaigne also knew a man blind from birth or near it who, in his observation of people and other business, made constant use of words relating to sight, though he depended upon hearing: "He will say as one of us: This hall hath a faire prospect: It is very faire weather: The Sunne shines cleare" (308) In the play also, though with a considerably different accent, "a man may see how this world goes without eyes" IV, vi, 153).

Among the evils that may so or may otherwise be seen, none is shown to the old Lear by his suffering, except what is entirely within his own personal history, filial ingratitude and bad judgment. But Lear is pierced to the heart by evidence, which his imagination renders, of many evils in human nature, and in the social system for which he has been responsible as king. These include the inadequacy of legal justice; the unprotectedness of the poor ("poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are"); the private lawlessness of those who administer the law; the power of wealth to moderate and poverty to sharpen justice:

. Plate sin with gold,
 And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;
 Arm it with rags, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it (vi, 169-).

and sensuality, particularly in woman. Montaigne considers all these also; and though the question may be put, "What does he not consider?" or "What but these could he consider?", there is some reply to it, fitting our present theory, in his accent and phrase, which in many instances is not very different from Shakspeare's. "Justice," he says, "on the one side, is used but for a cloake and ornament . . . (131):

"In the rabble case-canvassing of our plea-courts this by-word . . . *Let him joy in his good fortune*, is much in use, and is spoken of criminall offenders, who happen to meete with Judges in some milder temper, or well-pleased mood. For it is most certain that in times of condemnation, the Judges doome or sentence is sometimes perceived to be more sharpe, mercilesse and forward, and at other times more tractable, facile, and enclined to shadow or excuse an offence, according as he is well or ill pleased in mind" (278).

"You relate simply your case unto a Lawyer: he answers faltring and doubtfully unto it" (being brother to the one the Fool thinks on, punning on 'nothing': Then 'tis like the breath of an unfeed—lawyer, you gave me nothing for it" (I, iv, 143). "Have you paid him well, have you given him a good baite or fee, to make him earnestly apprehend it . . .? See then an apparant and undoubted truth presents it selfe to his understanding" (281).

Then, on the side of distributive justice, he discusses what he calls "lustfull desires," that is all inordinate and ungoverned appetite:

"*Lustfull desires* are either naturall, and necessary, as eating and drinking; or else naturall and not necessary, as the acquaintance of males and females: or else neither necessary nor naturall. Of this last kinde are almost all mens: For, they are all *superfluos* and artificiall. It is wonderfull to see with how little nature will be satisfied, and how little she hath left for us to be desired. The preparations in our kitchins doe nothing at all concerne her lawes" (165).

To my ear, quite possibly over-anxious, this seems echoed in Gloucester's speech after his conversion:

"Let the *superfluous and lust-dieted* man,
That slaves your ordinance, that will not see
Because he doth not feel, feel your power quickly:
So distribution should undo excess,
And each man have enough" (IV, i, 68-).

and in Lear's comment upon Regan's question why he should *need* even one servant:

O! reason not of need, our basest beggars
Are in the poorest things *superfluous*;
Allow not nature more than nature needs (II, iv, 267-)¹
Man's life is cheap as beast's.

But in both authors the "lustful desires" grow specialized in the modern sense. "Brute beasts," Montaigne says, "are much more regulare than we; and with more moderation containe themselves within the compasse, which nature hath prescribed them: yet not so exactly, but that they have some coherency with our riotous licentiousnesse" (166). Here Montaigne quotes a passage from Ovid which might have stirred the lines in the play beginning "Let copulation thrive" (IV, vi, 117-) and those immediately preceding. Ovid's birds that "breed by them, by whom themselves were bred" seem to have turned into Lear's adulterous wren (a libel on a neatly behaved bird which I have not seen explained). Then, note the passage about human gestation: physicians, philosophers, lawyers, divines are "*pell-mell* together by the eares with our women" about it (269). Join it with another of the sexual organs and appetites which "bid us range our selves unto a brutish situation . . . *more ferarum, Quadrupedumque magis ritu*" etc., and "those indiscreet and insolent motions, which women have so luxuriously found out . . ." (164) we are not far—the key words are almost always in the right place if one looks—from the continuing passages of the play, "To 't *luxury, pell-mell!*" and "down from the waist they are centaurs." Yet, more convincing, again, is the parallel between the basis for Lear's great climax, life is evil and we must endure it, and the passage Montaigne quotes from Lucretius (which comes to no climax):

Thou must be patient; we came crying hither:
Thou know'st the first time that we smell the air
We waul and cry

When we are born, we cry that we are come
To this great stage of fools (IV, vi, 183-):

Vagituque locum lugubri complet, ut æquum est
Cui tantum in vita restet transire malorum:

of which with its context, the infant just born, naked and helpless, Florio gives the translation:

Then, as is meet, with mour'full cries he fills the place
For whom so many ils remaine in his lives race (147).

We have thus followed the reconstruction of the God-King in the play as it was helped by the essay, beginning with his power and ending with his patience. But Lear is a father as well as a king, and the duplication of the theme of fathers and children in the sub-plot compels us to give it special treatment. Here we part company with the *Apologie* for a moment, to follow another essay of Montaigne, *Of the Affection of Fathers to their Children* (II, viii), as Shakspeare followed it. This concerns the distribution of property by aged fathers to their capable children; and Montaigne argues for it strongly, though with one choice condition:

"There is no reason . . . that a Gentleman of five and thirtie yeares should give place to his sonne, that is but twenty . . . But a father *over-burthend with -yeares*, and crazed through sicknesse, and by reason of weaknesse and want of health . . . doth both wrong himselfe, injure his, *idely* and to no use to hoord up . . . a great heape of riches . . . As for other pompe and trash whereof he hath no longer use or need; hee ought willingly to distribute and bestow them amongst those, to whom by *naturall* decree they ought to belong . . . The worthiest action, that ever the Emperour Charles the fifth performed was this . . . He resigned his meanes, his greatnesse and Kingdome to his Sonne, at what time he found his former undaunted resolution to decay . . . This fault, for a man not to be able to *know himselfe* betimes, and not to feele the impuissance and extreme alteration, that age doth naturally bring, both to the body and the minde . . . hath lost the reputation of the most part of the greatest men in the world" (II, 72, 73). "There are so many sorts of defects in age, and so much impuissance . . . Commandment and feare are no longer her weapons . . . I have knowen one whose youth had been very imperious and rough, but when he came to mans age . . . yet he chafeth, he scoldeth, he brawleth, and biteth, as the most boistrous and tempestuous mas-

ter . . ." (76). "I that am ready" to give up goods and authority to my children, "would give over unto them the full possession of my house, and enjoying of my goods, but with such liberties and limited condition, as if they should give me occasion, I might repent my selfe of my gift, and revoke my deed" . . . (74). "For, if they prove, or be such surly-furious beasts, or given to churlish disobedience, as our age bringeth forth thousands, they must as *beasts be hated*, as churls neglected, and as *denegerates avoided*" (75-).

Here surely is the abstract of Lear's abdication, and the philosophy of Edmund's forged letter, "This policy and reverence of age makes the world bitter to the best of our times. . . . I begin to find an idle and fond bondage in the oppression of aged tyranny; who sways, not as it hath power, but as it is suffered" (I, ii, 50-). Shakspeare's pen, as well as Montaigne's, was doubtless dipped in Charles' abdication ink, or some other thickened by special events of the time: but in the passages quoted there are several of the very phrases which occur in the play and there can be no question as to the immediate inkwell: "Idle" (that is, foolish, as in the essay), "Idle old man, that still would manage those authorities That he hath given away" (I, iii, 17-); "he hath ever but slenderly known himself" (i, 296). Also the essay confirmed some of the suggestions of the donnés, and so led to the situation in the play where Lear gives up "power, pre-eminence, and all the large effects that troop with majesty" (i, 132-), yet hoped, like Montaigne himself, to reserve some final authority, and found out too late that without what the essayist calls that "pompe and trash whereof hee hath no longer use or need," he could not defend himself nor yet "repente himselfe of his gift, and revoke his deed." The rest also follows in the pattern of the essays, overlaid upon patterns in the donnés. Gloucester finds Edgar, the alleged author of the letter, to be an abhorred, unnatural, detested, brutish, worse than brutish, villain (II, 83-): Lear holds that "nature is asham'd almost to acknowledge" Cordelia, Goneril is a "degenerate bastard" (iv, 277): and, if we need illustrate Montaigne's last quoted sentence completely, she is hated as a sea-monster, kite, serpent, wolf, and fox, in a few following lines, with more of the same sort in store for Regan.

Seeing that the outline of Edmund's character comes from the *Arcadia* where his prototype abuses father and brother, we need not stress Montaigne's assistance in developing it. His nature philosophy, "Thou Nature art my goddess" (I, ii, 1-) may have been prompted by the "naturall decree" (decree of nature) in the essay on *Fathers and Children*, which takes away the wealth of aged parents and bestows it upon those to whom it should belong. But equally well it might come from any part of the left wing of the current Nature-Nurture debate: "Nature," as Lyly's young Euphues boasts, who "was had in such estimation and admiration among the Heathen people, that she was reputed for the onely Goddess in Heaven." Returning to the *Apologie*, however, I find it clearly influencing Edgar's discussion of "astronomy" and planetary influence, even though it takes the affirmative while he takes the negative. Montaigne here discloses himself in his most fantastic vein, appearing as a "sectary" (he frequently uses the word, 204, 208; and "sects," 199, 209, etc.) of an extreme opinion:

"If our vertue, vices, sufficiency and knowledge, and the same discourse we make of the power of the starres . . . commeth as our reason judgeth by their meane and through their favour . . .

. . .
 Ecce patrem nati perimunt, natosque parentes,
 Mutuaque armati coeunt in vulnera fratres.
 Non nostrum hoc bellum est, coguntur tanta movere . . .
 Manil. *Astron.*

Loe sonnes kill fathers, fathers sonnes destroy,
 Brothers for mutuall wounds their armes doe beare,
 Such war is not our owne, forc't are we to it . . . (141).

"So men are borne, either more or lesse warlike, martiall, just, temperate and docile: here subject to wine, there to theft, and whoredom . . . grosse-witted or ingenious: either obedient or rebellious; good or bad, according as the inclination of the place beareth, where they are seated" . . . So we see "some heavenly influence . . . to produce this or that nature, and to encline mankind to this or that *biase*" (292).

Gloucester seems to believe all this, and sees the kingdom wrecked and the king fallen from "*bias of nature*" because of "these late eclipses" (I, ii, 115-): Edgar, who asks Edmund since when he had become "a *sectary* astronomical"

is himself fitter for the description (l. 169): Kent holds that "It is the stars, the stars above us govern our conditions" (IV, iii, 34-). But Edmund has read more than they have, particularly the following essay, *Of Judging of Others Death* (II, xiii), where Montaigne changes sides in one of those pleasant moments which make him so useful as a philosopher for a dramatist to follow, and says that the notion that the stars are concerned with death of men is a "*common fopperry*"¹ (328). So Edmund, joining all the passages, laughs at superstition:

"This is the excellent foppery of the world . . . as if we were villains of necessity . . . knaves, thieves, and traitors, by spherical predominance: drunkards, liars and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on: an admirable evasion of whoremaster man, to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star!" (I, ii, 132-).

His later actions, together with his philosophy expressed in his first speech adopting Nature as his goddess in defiance of law and custom, recalls yet another passage in the *Apologie*: this describes those whom "the new-fangles of Luther" have led away into "an execrable Atheisme," and predicts that if once "they be possessed with the boldnesse to despise, and malapertnesse to impugne the opinions . . . tofore held in awful reverence," they will soon reject as a "tyrannicall yoke all impressions they had in former times received by the authorities of Lawes, or reverence of ancient custome" (127).

III

This heretic Edmund is the indirect means of his father's attaining faith, just as the Fool is the indirect means of Lear's acquiring knowledge. But how valuable is this faith or knowledge? It is a question often answered unfavourably, which the *Apologie* helps us to answer in another way. Is this right? against Montaigne's own "*Que scais je?*" and the judgment of Pascal and the rest that his phrases of religion are mere mockery. If it is, here is the real value of such a study as we are making. Drawing up a list of parallels between essay and play is a diverting pastime.

Noting Shakspeare convey and convert other works to his use, seeing blow across a page sparks that set his imagination on fire, is more valuable. Learning from a work of his time the "discreet judgments" which he accepted, and rising from knowledge of his particular patterns to his general meaning: this is the most valuable of all. So, contrary to critics like Swinburne, who find the close of the play wholly without hope, "here is the grove of the Eumenides, here is the darkness everlasting," I am inclined to say, here is faith in a spiritual order of immense power, under law, where causes release consequences beyond computation, of suffering or of happiness. And here is knowledge of the mysteries of God

Disbelievers in such a "happy ending" (bare and attenuated beyond all earthly use) cite the intolerable bitterness of the play's final scene as their evidence, and quote the irreligious judgments scattered throughout the play. There are many of these last, particularly in the fourth act. Gloucester says, "As flies to *wanton* boys are we to gods: they kill us for their sport": but he says it before his change, at a time when he is unable to see what Shakspeare makes us see clearly, that there is a causal connection between the way he has treated Edmund and the way Edmund treats him (IV, i, 36-). The good but dull Edgar commenting upon the blinding of Gloucester says "The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices make ministers to plague us" (V, iii, 172-): and in saying this, he helps us to say that it is his own unpleasant virtue of believing everything that Edmund told him, quite as much as the bastardy, that "cost him his eyes." Albany holds that the death of Cornwall "shows you are above, you justicers," wholly forgetting that a loyal servant, whom supposedly the Justicers forgot, was killed killing him (IV, ii, 78-). Apologizing for the trick he has played on his blind father, Edgar bids him "Think that the clearest gods, who make them honours of men's impossibilities, have preserved thee" (vi, 73-). Surely there is not one of these that stands thinking on. Singly or together they lack value as evidence of the playwright's disbelief in a spiritual order, and are, every one of them, examples of the common human desire to "join God to destiny," and see divine assent when our

space of the world goes to our liking, and dissent when it does not. Montaigne helps us to see this, and it seems likely that it is because of him that Shakspeare introduced these passages into the play: against the inducements of other pious-minded contemporaries of his, such as Holinshed, or such as the author of the old play whose conclusion nicely proves that "just Jehova . . . Doth governe all things in this spacious world," allowing no outrageous acts to be committed without "just revenge."

Montaigne reflects upon the matter very candidly, and gives precise advice about it to any within hearing:

"How rashly have they joynd God unto destiny? (Which at my request, let none that beareth the sur-name of a Christian, doe at this day) . . . This . . . bold fiercenesse, to seeke to discover God, by and with our eyes . . . is the cause of that which daily hapneth unto us, which is, by a particular assignation, to impute all important events to God, which because they do not touch us, it seemeth they also touch him, and that he regardeth them with more care and attention, than those that are but slight and ordinary unto us" (235).

"It was a strange conceit, with our own affliction to goe about to please and appay divine goodness. As the Lacedemonians, who flattered and *wantonized* their Diana, by torturing of yong boys, whom often in favour of her they caused to be whipped to death" (227)—a passage suggestive of the plays "as flies to wanton boys are we to gods," previously quoted.

Therefore I hold to the *Apologie* here: it helped Shakspeare to reform the naive pietism of the *donnée*, and helps us to see why he did it. With this help, we can partly understand the ironies introduced into Cordelia's history (which indeed go beyond Montaigne in their violence). "The gods to their dear shelter take thee, maid"; and they seem to, when France takes her; then seem not to, when she returns on their business and loses the battle. "The gods defend her." And then, "Enter Lear, with Cordelia (dead) in his arms."

But there is more to say of Cordelia, and the divine love of which she is the agent, and the redemption which she achieves: "thou hast one . . . who redeems Nature from the general curse." (IV, vi, 210-). Even after the defeat of

her army, and with the prospect of death for herself, she says with simple conviction: "We are not the first, who, with best meaning, have incurr'd the worst." God was no more disproved by their misfortune than he would have been proved had they prospered. And so also with herself. The old play had made her a model of Christian piety: the transferred worship of the Virgin which Shakspeare had learned in his youth from the *Arcadia* and the *Book of the Courtier* helped him to develop her character. Considering some of her beauties, "Her voice was ever soft, Gentle and low, an excellent thing in woman;" one thinks of her, too, as close to his own desire. Considering her inability to "heave her heart into her mouth" (the idea is in the old play) and the echo of Luke ii, 49, in her "O dear father! it is thy business that I go about" (IV, v, 23-), and the Parable of the Tares, which her marvellous description of Lear's crown of thorns also suggests, together with the redemption she brings—"she lives. If it be so it is a chance which does redeem all sorrows" (V, iii, 268), and he comes to believe that she lives—one thinks of Isaiah's prevision of Christ. Or if this last be too high (I can understand how Shakspeare could have used the Bible phrases out of an overflowing memory without deliberate intent, but I do not believe that he used them so) then say that in Lear's *Divine Comedy*, which has its descent into hell, "There's hell . . . there is the sulphurous pit" (IV, vi, 130-), and its purgation, "Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound upon a wheel of fire" (vii, 46-): and its emparadising (V, ii, 7-25), she is Beatrice.

Montaigne was naturally unable to conceive such a character. The one great love of his life, for Estienne de la Boétie, did not touch the *Apologie*. Yet it would have been strange if, possessing even so small and segregated a parcel of Renaissance Christianity as he did possess, he had not groped after such a pattern. Human reason being dependent upon sense data, as he says, and the senses most fallible, we have no way to come to absolute truth but by Faith. And yet, if only there were such a person: not foiled as we are foiled! "We had need of some body void and exempted from all these qualities, that without any preoccupation of

judgment might judge of these propositions as indifferent unto him: By which account we should have a judge, that were no man" (322). Then, of that "soveraigne good of chief felicity" to which we desire to come, all the philosophers agree that it "consisteth in the peace and tranquillitie of the soule and bodie: but where shall we finde it?" (312, 186). We cannot find it. Heavenly conditions "must be thought to be unimaginative, unspeakable and incomprehensible" (223). And yet again, *could* we attain to it, would we not be resolved and unshakeable!

"Had we fast-hold on God, by the interposition of a lively faith; had we hold-fast on God by himselfe, and not by us; had we a divine foundation, then should not humane and worldly occasions have the power so to shake and totter us, as they have. Our hold would not then yeeld to so weake a batterie: The love of noveltie: the constraint of Princes: the good successe of one partie: the rash and casuall changing of our opinions should not then have the power to shake and alter our beleefe" (129) "Why will not nature" (we might almost change it, to go with the other, into "Then will nature") one day be pleased to open her bosome to us, and make us perfectly see the meanes and conduct of her motions, and enable our eyes to judge of them . . ." (244).

This, I think it will be conceded, is prose and essayist version of the Paradise passage (as we may call it) of *King Lear* V, iii, 7-19: and it almost seems as though, in the living mosaic of great art, Shakspeare had joined to this two other separate passages: first, from the old play, the scene where Lear and Cordelia alternately kneel one to the other and ask forgiveness and blessing: and second Montaigne's trifle, "Let a Philosopher be put in a cage made of small and thin-set iron wire" (314). So, as by "heavenly alchemy" out of separateness, disorder, simplicity, we have it finally: the two philosophers, joined in more than Stoic serenity, on their way to a cage and prison, secure above novelty, the constraint of princes, the alternation of parties, having fast-hold upon God:

Lear: No, no, no, no! Come, let's away to prison;
 We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage:
 When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down,
 And ask of thee forgiveness: so we'll live,
 And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh

At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues
 Talk of court news: and we'll talk with them too,
 Who loses and who wins: who's in, who's out;
 And take upon 's the mystery of things,
 As if we were God's spies

The play, admittedly, does not come to an end with this passage. It is not satisfied until Cordelia is dead, and Lear dead: departing intolerably, as it seems to some, from the old play. But perhaps here also Montaigne may be of help to those who wish that the perfected king and this daughter of perfection might have been allowed some earthly and happy years together:

"The soule by reason of her trouble and imbecility, as unable to subsist of herself, is ever, and in all places questing and searching comforts, hopes, foundations, and forraine circumstances, on which she may take hold and settle herselfe" (264).

Such days of peace as the old play gave, and as Shakspeare could have given, would be such a "forraine circumstance?" It appears so: "He hates him That would upon the rack of this tough world Stretch him out longer." So the end of the play as we have it, the curse brought by two "redeemed" by one, and that one hanged: all sorrows whatever the aged king met "redeemed by the final effort of his mind, and that effort the by-product of an apoplexy—perhaps this may be best explained (*que sais je?*) by Montaigne also. I myself am inclined to believe it:

"Verily there was great reason, that we should be beholding to God alone, and to the benefit of his grace, for the benefit of so noble a believe, since from his liberalitie alone we receive the fruit of immortalitie, which consisteth in enjoying of eternall blessednesse. Let us ingenuously confesse, that only God and Faith, hath told it us: For, it is no lesson of Nature, nor comming from our reason" (265).

¹Pointed out by Robertson, p 108

"MY GRACIOUS SILENCE!"

By DAVID BROWN

CORIOLANUS'S words (*Coriolanus*, II, i, 187) in greeting his wife have been received with enthusiastic appreciation by all the commentators whom Furness cites (New Variorum edition, by H. H. Furness, Jr.). No matter what his temper, the critic finds nothing but praise for them, from Warburton—"it conveys the finest praise that can be given to a good woman"—through Ruskin—"The 'Nothing, my lord,' of Cordelia, and the 'gracious silence' of Virgilia are the everlasting seals set by the Master of the human heart upon the most sacred writing of its folded and golden leaves"—to J. M. Murray—"Magical words! They give a miraculous substance to our fleeting, fading glimpses of a lovely vision which seems to tremble away from the clash of arms and pride that reverberates through the play." These things, no doubt, are finely said, nor do I wish here to make objection to the voluble flow of words which Virgilia's silence has provoked among men. Shakspeare has given Virgilia more words than Plutarch had, but did not add so many as to give her any imperfection in this respect. Needing her in his play, and finding little to characterize her in his source, he seized unerringly on her silence as a positive trait and added physical timidity as a contrast both with her husband and with her mother-in-law (to the latter of whom Shakspeare had given more words than his source supplied and rather more warlike virtue). Thus, for different reasons, Virgilia is, like Cordelia and Desdemona, a woman of few words, and those words true.

What I miss among the commentators is reference to the tinge of irony in Coriolanus's words, to his affectionate enough compression of the proverbial utterances on the value of woman's silence in his epithet. For this seems to me to be implicit in the figure of speech he uses for her and seems to me to have been the source of the figure in Shakspeare's mind. One need not cite the multitude of jests on woman's talkativeness, which is the other side of the idea.

"To be slow in words," says Launce, "is a woman's only virtue" (*TGV*, III, i, 338). This sort of thing is embedded in Coriolanus's words. More exactly, a comic and highly memorable scene of Ben Jonson's *Volpone*, written in 1606 and published in 1607, not long before the writing of *Coriolanus*, provided Shakspeare with the phrase he used and with the information that it was of classical origin and dignity.

Lady Politic: I have a little studied physic; but now
I'm all for music, save, in the forenoons,
An hour or two for painting. I would have
A lady, indeed, to have all, letters and arts,
Be able to discourse, to write, to paint;
But principal, as Plato holds, your music,
And so does wise Pythagoras, I take it,
Is your true rapture; when there is concent
In face, in voice, and clothes: and is, indeed,
Our sex's chiefest ornament.

Volpone: The poet
As old in time as Plato, and as knowing,
Says that *your highest female grace is silence.*
(III, ii, 68-79)

Shakspeare need not have known that the poet was Sophocles in his *Ajax* (I, 293). Γύναι, γυναῖξί κόσμον ἢ σιγὴ φέρει (Woman, to women silence is the best ornament), but I think it likely that he had Ben Jonson's phrase in mind.

The mingling of irony and affection is the essence of Shakspeare's point of view when love is the theme, and the compression of a whole proverb in an epithet is the essence of the style of his later plays. It is perhaps not inappropriate in this connection to remember Lear's words over the dying Cordelia:

"Her voice was ever soft,
Gentle and low—an excellent thing in woman."
(*Lear*, V, iii, 272-3)

The old joke about women, which the Wyf of Bath resented, is buried here in the pathos of Lear's words. And it is this kind of Shaksperian affection, I think, that the critics have missed in Coriolanus's greeting of his wife.

Bucknell University
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

SHAKSPERE — WHEN?

(Experiences with Shakspeare in the Fifth Grade, College Elementary School, Flagstaff, Arizona.)

If the fifth grade had not had access to the juvenile shelves at the college library, it might not have happened; and if, when the children began to use the card catalogue instead of going to the shelves, the teachers had not deliberately spurred them on, it might have been different. However, when call slips presented at the desk began to concentrate on mysteries and ghost stories, and when children most reluctantly substituted books of the teacher's choice for S. S. Van Dyne, it was evident that something must be done. It was, of course, a problem in substitution; but *Treasure Island*, *Little Women*, *Arabian Nights*—the old stand-bys had all been read. Gradually, the solution began to frame itself: Charles and Mary Lamb—Shakspeare—why not?

So it was that the better readers of the fifth grade class (approximately fifteen from a class of thirty) heard *Midsummer Night's Dream*, from *Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare*. They liked it, they said; in fact, they liked it immensely, in spite of the many characters and the difficulty of keeping them straight. The second day brought *The Merchant of Venice* to an even more enthusiastic audience, and *Romeo and Juliet*, the third day, was voted the best ever. The fourth day each child was given a copy of *The Tempest* from *Lamb's Tales* and allowed to read it for himself. "It's the best story we ever read," they declared; "Let's play it." The greatest difficulty was that all except one wanted to be Ariel, and that one would be Miranda if she might change the name to one she liked better.

The following day, the class was provided with copies of Shakspeare's *Tempest*, and passages from it were read; some by the teacher, some by the children, while individuals read orally some of the simpler passages. Finally, the class dramatized the log-carrying scene and asked to play the entire story. Being told that the play would require at least two hours, the children willingly turned their attention to

King John. Briefly, the teacher told of the relationship between Arthur and King John, of French intervention, of the war, and of Arthur's imprisonment. With a copy in the hands of each child, the class read the scene where Arthur pleads with Hubert to save his eyes. Most of it was read by the teacher, although children were called upon to help with the simpler lines of conversation.

Enthusiasm ran high. The pupils wanted to present the scene; other members of the class felt that they were missing something, and the entire class was divided into groups of four, the better readers taking the parts of Arthur and Hubert, and the others those of the executioners. The groups scattered themselves about the campus and read. They carried books home with them, and by the second morning two children had almost memorized Arthur's lines, while another practically knew the part of Hubert. Furthermore, one little girl reported: "Since the teacher didn't tell us what happened to Arthur, I got our Shakspeare down and found out." She told, in detail, of Arthur's escape and of his death. She knew what he had said on the wall, and after he had jumped. She also remarked: "Hubert had a terrible time convincing the nobles he hadn't killed Arthur."

Finally, two groups presented the scene; one to a group of parents; one to a college English class. The latter group questioned the children about their work, and one child, being asked how she liked Shakspeare, said: "The more times I read it the better I like it." Another declared: "When I go to bed at night, it keeps running through my head, and I know Hubert's part as well as Arthur's." Two children began to greet the teachers with a playful "Good Morrow, Hubert." Other quotations which crept into usage were: "I would that I were your son, so you would love me;" "I warrant I love you more than you do me;" and "By my Christendom, so I were out of prison and kept sheep, I should be merry as the day is long."

We feel justified in drawing the following conclusions concerning the activity:

1. The children know that Shakspeare was a playwright. They know a little of his plays.
2. The name "Shakspeare" means to them pleasant and interesting experiences.
3. We have a foundation on which to build as the children grow older.
4. All children have memorized certain beautiful passages and some have begun to use quotations.

Of course, it would be foolish to consider teaching Shakspeare to all fifth grade children. Necessary pre-conditions would be:

1. A group of children displaying somewhat mature reading tastes.
2. A love for Shakspeare on the part of the teacher.
3. A readiness to note the first symptoms of fatigue or lack of interest on the part of the class, and to drop the work when such symptoms appear.

However, we feel that the work with this particular group was highly worth while, and that we have had from the lips of a ten year old child an expression of the surest sign of Shakspeare's greatness: "The more times I read it, the better I like it."

IVERNIA TYSON.

*220 East Fifth Street,
Florence, Colorado.*

COMMUNICATION

McKERRROW'S NEW SHAKSPERE TEXT

It is one of the quirks of fortune that Shakspeare, the most edited poet in any language, had never had the benefit of the sort of textual editing that nearly all lesser men receive as a matter of scholarly course. It is no

disparagement of the purposes of the innumerable editors from Rowe to Dover Wilson and Professor Kittredge (or is there a later one in the morning mail?) to observe that the simple scholarly question, "What is the text as Shakspeare wrote it?" has never been answered, nay, never been es-

said.*

Between the facsimile editions, either photographic or typographical, and the modernized versions there has been no fixed point. That Professor Ronald B. McKerrow is in process of trying to establish The forthcoming text will appear under the aegis of the Clarendon Press. The work has been under way, among other multifarious duties of the editor, for about ten years, and has reached the point where the announcement of publication dates may be anticipated. That we may know more about his intentions, methods, and editorial decisions, Dr McKerrow has issued a *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, a study in editorial method, which will reappear as the general introduction to the work.

Avowedly conservative, McKerrow is attempting to "present Shakspeare's work as nearly in the form in which he left it as the evidence which we have permits, clearing it indeed as far as possible of the numerous errors with which the ignorance and carelessness of copyists and printers have disfigured it, but without superfluous comment or any attempt to improve upon the text as the author left it."

Not a textual scholar, I shall not abuse my readers' patience with an uncritical discussion of the fascinating problems that are faced. Little has been written on the subject of editorial method in handling the problems peculiar to Elizabethan texts; to that little this addition must be great. Its assured modesty and calm a priori certainty that some cruxes cannot be made to evaporate begets confidence. Particularly logical are the disclaimers to a scientific method. McKerrow will not proceed from possibilities to asseverations of certainties with little

regard to the impossibility of being sure

"It might, indeed, be better if in the domain of literary research the words 'proof' and 'prove' were banished altogether from statements of results obtained, for they can seldom be appropriate even in the work of the youngest and least experienced thesis-writer. Nothing can be gained, and much may be lost, by a pretense of deriving results of scientific accuracy from data which are admittedly uncertain and incomplete."

The forthcoming edition can be superficially described. Four or five plays will comprise a volume. The page will be externally similar to the Arden Edition, but the type will be larger. Textual notes will appear at the foot of the page, separated from the other notes. The plays will be presented in the virtual order in which they were written, Sir Edmund Chambers' dating being followed. The text will be the 'most authoritative' text of each play, that is, "that one of the early texts, which, on a consideration of their genetic relationship, appears likely to have deviated to the smallest extent . . . from the author's manuscript," reproducing that version rather than synthetically combining it with others. Wording, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and verse division will follow the original, even where inconsistent. Where there is good evidence of a printer's error, McKerrow will correct it, but he will not assume the right to alter what may have been the copy handed the printer.

Dr. McKerrow's undertaking is invaluable. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press could not have selected more wisely. I hope the vicissitudes of war and health do not interfere with what promises to be the crowning work of a brilliant career.

JOHN WILCOX.

Wayne University
Detroit, Mich.

*And in all probability never will be answered—Ed.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

—:—

HAMLET, SR. — MERCHANT OR KNIGHT?

Horatio, explaining to Marcellus and Bernardo (and to us) the cause of the threatened war on Denmark, gives details of a challenge-combat between Hamlet, Sr. and Fortinbras, Sr. According to the terms of the combat, embodied in 'a Seal'd Compact, / Well ratified by Law, and Heraldrie,' Hamlet would have forfeited to Fortinbras certain lands 'Had he bin Vanquisher, as by the same Cou'nant / And carriage of the Article designe¹ [*sic*], / His fell to *Hamlet*.' The second Quarto (Q2), the first issues of which were published in 1604, prints this passage as follows:

'Had he bin vanquisher, as by the same
comart,
And carriage of the article desseigne,
His fell to Hamlet,' (I, 1, 92-94).

It is noteworthy that in this passage Q2 not only substitutes "comart" for F's 'Cou'nant' but corrupts the word 'designd' into desseigne (a variant 16th-century spelling), also partly an *e:d* error (Q2 has another *e:d* error in the word 'returne' at the end of line 91, where F reads correctly 'return'd'.) From the time of Warburton editors have been debating whether Shakspeare had written 'comart' or 'Cov'nant'. Even before the recent flamboyant but fortunately abortive attempt to give Q2 a standing which it does not deserve, some editors have incorporated Q's reading

into their text for various reasons, though the vast majority of scholars and editors prefer F's word. It should be unnecessary to say to one who knows the temper of Shaksperian scholars that some have damned both houses and have proposed adopting a later Quarto's 'compact.'

In defence of 'comart' or 'co-mart,' defined as a 'bargain' or a 'joint bargain,' it has been urged that, with the reading 'cov'nant,' the words 'And carriage [= tenor] of the article [= clause] design'd' are tautologous, inasmuch as 'covenant' means the same as 'the article design'd' (Parrott & Craig—after Warburton). Rather than to charge Shakspeare with having been guilty of a tautology, 'it seems better to suppose that [he] coined the word [comart] on the basis of "marte" [in line 74] . . . and that a scribe changed it to the more familiar "cov'nant"' (Parrott & Craig).

'Comart' is objectionable for several reasons. The *Oxford Dictionary* (N.E.D.) records no other instance of the occurrence of this word. Of course, Shakspeare might have coined it for the occasion, but inasmuch as he had a perfectly good, euphonious and easily intelligible word, which also satisfied the metrical requirements of the verse, there was no need for the coinage of a neologism. As for the alleged tautology: if the 'comart' refers to the legal and heraldic 'compact'—and all editors admit it does—the carriage of the article designed is just as tautologous with 'co-mart' as with 'covenant.' Furthermore, Shakspeare had no aversion to being tautological. (Is not the word 'same' in line 92 superfluous?) But line 93 is not tautologous; it refers solely to that clause in the covenant

¹The Folio (F), whose text we reproduce here, reads "designe" for "designd", obviously because of a copyist's or compositor's misreading of an *e* for a *d*, one of the most frequent misreadings in Elizabethan secretary script.

which related to the forfeiture of lands. 'Comart' is objectionable, too, because it suggests a bargain when arranging the terms and conditions of a duel. Heraldry, derived from chivalry, does not concern itself with bargaining.

'Cov'nant,' on the contrary, is exactly the word required in this passage. From time immemorial knights before a battle entered into solemn covenants. The word 'mart' would have cheapened the exploit of the 'valiant Hamlet'.

It will be recalled that the combatants entered into a 'sealed compact well ratified by law and heraldry.' The *Oxford Dictionary* teaches us that in English law 'a promise or contract under seal' was a 'covenant.'

The apostrophe in F's 'Cou'nant,' which is a hint towards the reduction of the verse into a pentameter (by substituting *th'* for *the*), combined with the many other punctilious indications of elision in the F text of this play (a comparatively rare phenomenon in Q2), shows that this text is based on Shakspeare's own manuscript (or on a fairly faithful copy). No one living in 1623 had made such a study of Shakspeare's prosody as to have been capable of editorially indicating all these elisions, and surely a compositor or scribe could not have done so.

That 'comart' is a misreading of 'counant' (written by a careless copyist of Shakspeare's manuscript) is deducible from the following considerations. Double-stemmed minuscule secretary *r* and *n* were frequently written so nearly alike as to be indistinguishable. In this very play we find, in Q2, '*Guyldersterne*' for '*Guldenstern*' (in II, ii), 'a working' for 'a winking' (II, ii, 136 [Furness]), one of the instances in which even Parrott and Craig desert Wilson),

'euer' for 'euen' (II, ii, 266, a Folio reading which even Wilson adopts—silently), 'when' for 'where' (II, ii, 426, P & C out Wilson Wilson by adopting 'when'), 'Lord' for 'loue' (III, ii, 159,—*u* and *n* are graphically identical), 'ore' for 'on' (IV, vii, 135,—in which case even Wilson, P & C, and Kittredge follow F, although many editors have adopted the Q text), and 'massene' (!) for 'Mazard' (V, i, 85, *n* for *i*, and *e* for *d*).

From a study of the text of several of Shakspeare's best-printed plays we deduce that when he had occasion to write several short-minim letters in succession he not infrequently added a minim or omitted one. If he did that in 'cou'nant' his copyist or the compositor could easily have misread the 'un' for 'm'. This, combined with a mistaking of *r* for *n*, would give us 'comart' for 'counant'. That the scribe who wrote the Q2 text, or the compositor who set it up, was a dull, unimaginative, uncultured and ill-spoken peasant is shown by this Quarto's many absurd readings, among which 'comart,' though bad, is by no means one of the worst. That he did not have access to an authoritative manuscript or to some person who knew the play, is shown not only by the many flagrant blunders but even more by the occasional omission of words and phrases which he could not decipher.

MEDDLING WITH SHAKSPEARE'S TEXT

The atrociously garbled first quarto (Q1) of *Hamlet* makes Polonius say to his son (in I, iii, 64-66, Furness) 'do not dull the palme with entertaine, / Of euery new vnflieg'd courage, / Beware of entrance into a quarrell'. The infinitely better but also unauthorised second quarto (Q2) repro-

duces this in the following fashion:

'doe not dull thy palme with entertain-
ment
Of each new hatcht vnfedgd courage,
beware
Of entiance to a quarrell.'

The first Folio (F1) gives us this text:

'doe not dull thy palme, with entertain-
ment
Of each vn hatch't, vnfedg'd Comrade.
Beware
Of entiance to a quarrell'

In the F1 version the absurd 'vn-hatch't' (written 'unhatch't') is surely due to a misreading of 'un' (for the manuscript's 'nu' (a common Elizabethan spelling of 'new')). The important change from the quartos is the substitution of 'Comrade' for 'courage.' Up to very recently all editors followed F1 in retaining 'Comrade,' which makes perfectly good sense and good Shaksperian verse if (as Shakspeare sometimes did) we put the stress on the second syllable.

Up to 1918 'Comrade' seems to have been objected to only by one commentator. Mr Badham, quoted by Furness, called it a 'trashy correction made by the later Quartos [!]' for the original reading *courage*.' But Mr Badham was evidently not satisfied with Shakspeare's 'original reading' and proposed to improve on him by reading *court-ape*! Mr. C M Ingleby also seems to have approved (in 1856) of 'courage' as a euphemism for a 'gallant.' Thus the matter stood until almost the end of 1918 when Mr J D. Wilson, determined to vindicate Q2's superiority over F1, labelled 'comrade' a 'piece of dirt' and the whole passage 'an addled metaphor,' even though he conceded that 'courage' was nonsense. (He had evidently not heard of Ingleby's suggestion) The agreement of the two quartos in the bad reading 'courage'

he attributed to their having been printed from the same manuscript, a 'smudged' manuscript which misled the compositor, and to the fact that the original and correct word must have contained a tailed letter near its termination. Substituting a *y* for the *g* in 'courage,' aided with a little more jugglery, *more suo*, he discovered that Shakspeare's word was 'coccnaye,' a possible spelling for 'cocnaye,' a word which, he said, meant cock's egg, hence 'an affected brainless young person.' This word the Folio compositor mistook for 'comrayd' and set it up as 'comrade.'

This 'pretty emendation' (so Mr. Wilson proudly called it in 1934) led to considerable discussion in the pages of the London *Times Literary Supplement* in 1918-19. Professor Gollancz thought 'comrade' an 'undoubtedly erroneous reading' and could make nothing of 'courage.' Neither did he like 'cockney.' He therefore proposed reading 'coragio' in the sense of a 'hail fellow,' though he could cite no dictionary or any Elizabethan writer in its support. Along came Mr Brett with the suggestion that Shakspeare's word was 'comrague,' a variant of 'comrogue' (= a fellow rogue). Other suggestions followed; Mr. Thompson favored reading 'covey' or 'couvade' (= 'a coterie of raw and callow friends'), Mr. Sargeant suggested 'covrage' or 'coverage' (= a nestling), and Mr. Rose proposed substituting the Italian 'cornacchia' (= a crow, a chatterer).

Subsequently, in 1934, Mr Wilson reluctantly abandoned his 'cockney' and embraced Q2's 'courage,' explaining that in the interim he had learned that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the word 'courage' sometimes 'denoted persons, much as we now speak of *sparks* or *braves*,' and was so used by Sir Thomas Hoby

in his translation of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, 'a book on which Shakespeare is most likely to have drawn for the character of Polonius.' Thus the quartos were 'completely vindicated'!

Of recent editors only Messrs Parrott and Craig have followed Wilson in adopting the Q2 reading, even though they distort W's argument by saying that 'courage was sometimes applied to 'a man of high spuit' They do not explain why Polonius should have warned his son against a man of high spirit. (Sir Thomas used the word in a highly complimentary sense, the equivalent of his author's *animus divini*.) To P & C 'it seems plain' that 'courage' was Sh's word, because Q1 and Q2 agree. To me, however, it seems plain that the Q1 and Q2 reading is the result of a misreading of Sh's word by the scribe of copy for Q1 and borrowing thence by the scribe of copy of Q2.

Professor Kittredge, in his recent edition of the play, very sensibly retains the F1 reading, partly because the text requires a word which should be stressed on the second syllable (the *Oxford Dictionary* shows that the word 'comrade' was frequently so pronounced, not so 'courage'), but he puzzles us when he goes on to say that 'courage is an obvious misprint [''] for *comrague*, i.e., a fellow rogue.'

The confusion inherent in these

discussions is, in all likelihood, due to an acceptance of Professor Wilson's erroneous notion that the ultimate or penultimate letter of Shakspeare's original word must have been a tailed letter (*g, b, p, q, x, y, z*). One who knows the peculiarities of Elizabethan 'secretary' script knows, however, that 'comrade' could have been written with a *d* which looked like a *g*. In the F1 text of *Troilus and Cressida* we have (in V, ii, 10) 'finde' instead of 'singe,' (initial *j* mistaken for *f*, one mistake leading to another), in IV, v, 13, we have 'yong' for 'yond,' and in IV, iv, 24 'strange' for 'strand'—in all three instances a *g* substituted for a *d*, showing that the scribe made a *d* with a flourished downstroke which went down and to the left below the writing line (Professor Leon Kellner, by the way, never noticed these *g:d* errors.) Such a *d* is depicted in my book, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance* (see the 10th *d* in §14 on page 36). It follows, therefore, that 'comrade,' making exceptionable sense, being perfectly appropriate in the mouth of Polonius, agreeing with Shakspeare's habit of mixing his metaphors, fitting the metrical requirements of the verse, and resembling the bad word 'courage,' is the word that Shakspeare intended and that Shakspeare wrote. Thus again the Folio text of *Hamlet* is vindicated.

S A T

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



Index of Names in the 1939 Bibliography

Roan Barbary

An Agnostic Life of Shakspere

Shakspere's Plays in the Richmond Theatre,
1819 - 1838

Ascham's Scholemaster and Spenser's
February Eclogue

Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET
New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH
15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.
Major Edward Bowes
Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.
Hardin Craig, Ph.D.
Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.
Frank Gilmore
Walter Hampden
Frank J. Hogan
Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.
George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.
Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.
Fritz Leiber
Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.
Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.
John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.
Julia Marlowe, LL.D.
Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.
Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.M.
Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.
Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.
Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.
Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.
Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Otis Skinner, A.M.
Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.
John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison
70 Broadway
New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum
601 West 113th Street
New York

Board of Directors

1936

John Robert Gregg
Paul Kaufman
Robert M. Smith
Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1937

Miss Olive I. Carter
Arthur Heins
Frank L. Short
Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1938

George W. Davison
John E. Hannigan
John H. H. Lyon
Miss Charlotte E. Porter
A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON

VOL 15

APRIL, 1940

No. 2

C O N T E N T S

| | PAGE |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Yon Pomegranate Tree (Poem) | <i>Grace Warren Landrum</i> 66 |
| Roan Barbary | <i>Paul Fatout</i> 67 |
| An Agnostic Life of Shakspeare | <i>Robert M. Smith</i> 75 |
| Shakspeare's Plays in the Richmond Theatre, 1819-1838 | <i>Martin Staples Shockley</i> 88 |
| Soliloquy on Hamlet (Poem) | 94 |
| Index of Names and Subjects in the 1939 Bibliography | <i>Ralph P. Rosenberg</i> 95 |
| Ascham's Scholemaster and Spenser's February Eclogue | <i>Sidney Rosenzweig</i> 103 |
| James Fenimore Cooper and Shakspeare | <i>Edward P. Vandiver, Jr.</i> 110 |
| Tennyson's Earliest Shakspeare Parallels | <i>E. A. Mooney, Jr.</i> 117 |
| Editorial Notes and Comments | <i>S. A. T.</i> 125 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

YON POMEGRANATE TREE

"Nightly she sings on yon pomegranate tree",
The nightingale of Juliet's starry view,
Whose notes, vibrant forever, swell to me
Triumphant love-death, gloriously new,
As if the crowd in fair Verona's town
Gazed still at lips red as pomegranate flower,
Red, red as Tybalt's blood, and soft as down
Of bed which mocked her clamorous nuptial hour
In land far off the blossom sings her doom,
Where mockingbirds lost in the dusky leaves
With muted midnight softness pierce the gloom
To lessen pain to one that lately grieves
The fruit's rich dye repeats the blossom's hue
Red to the heart, death love-ensanguined, true.

GRACE WARREN LANDRUM

Williamsburg, Virginia

ROAN BARBARY

By PAUL FATOUT

AMONG the domestic animals alluded to by Shakspeare, the horse merits most frequent and affectionate attention. Madden¹ surmises that Shakspeare must have owned a saddle-horse; be that as it may, the many allusions to curb, rein, bridle, spur, pace, the manage, jades, pack-horse, post-horse, courser, Barb, and so on, indicate that, like a good Englishman, he quickened at the sight or touch of spirited horseflesh.

However, English horses in his time were generally of mixed breeding, or of no breeding whatever. Despite legislation to improve horse stock as early as the reign of Henry II, active efforts by Henry VII, and drastic regulations by Henry VIII, Elizabethan horses were still nondescript. According to Holinshed:

King Henry VIII erected a noble studderie for breeding horses, especially the greatest sorte, and for a time had verie good success with them. The officers however seemed wearie and procured a mixed breed of baser races, whereby his good purpose came to little effect.²

Elizabeth herself, though an accomplished horsewoman, and fond also of those well-known jaunts about the country with a great retinue of carts, carriages, and saddle-horses (as many as 2400 horses, Holinshed reports), seems not to have instigated Parliamentary measures for improvement. Hence, the horses of Shakspeare's time were heterogeneous.

Until the improvement of firearms and artillery, a change which means the passing of armor, the effort had been to breed heavy horses capable of bearing the weight of a man in armor (about 400 pounds) and of sustaining the shock of combat.³ No doubt, York's "bonny beast"⁴ is such a Great Horse; so, too, is Adonis's, which Shakspeare describes in detail.⁵ "Broad breast," "thick tail" (as distinguished from the thinner, finer-haired tail of the light horse, particularly the Oriental), "short-jointed" (well coupled, we should say), and "broad buttock" indicate a heavy horse, comparable to the modern draft type; the "high crest" is a

characteristic of the draft stallion today even as of Adonis's stallion. "Fetlocks shag and long," *i.e.*, a heavy feather on the legs, is found on both the Clydesdale, a Scotch breed, and the Shire, the oldest of the English draft breeds. The latter is a descendant of the High Almaine, the Friesland, and the Flanders, all of which were known in Elizabethan England, as noted by Blundeville; heavy horses, bred on the continent for war, they had been imported as early as the thirteenth century for crossing on the scrubby native stock. Although Shakspeare does not mention any of these by name, his frequent use of "shock"⁶ as an image derived from evolutions of the heavy war horse indicates that he was familiar with the type.

Adonis's horse is also a "lusty courser," a term used by Shakspeare both in the sense of a heavy horse fit for tournament and war, and also in its later, seventeenth century, sense of a fast, light horse.⁷

Shakspeare's admiration, indeed, is chiefly for the more spirited light horse. With armor going out of fashion and Elizabethan prosperity setting in, hunting with horses and hounds, and to a lesser extent racing,⁸ became required social accomplishments, both of the nobleman to the manner born and of the parvenu. Shakspeare accurately observes his tumultuous society:

Some glory in their birth, some in their skill,
Some in their wealth, some in their body's force;
Some in their garments, though new-fangled ill,
Some in their hawks and hounds, some in their horse.⁹

The horsiness of the best people gives ironic point to the colloquy between Beatrice and Margaret:

Bea.: By my troth, I am exceeding ill: heigh-ho!
Marg · For a hawk, a horse, or a husband?¹⁰

Like Chaucer's Monk, the Tudor gentry

yaf not of that text a pulled hen,
That seith, that hunters been not holy men.¹¹

However, no Elizabethan gentleman—not even the king—owned a stable comparable to the fast thoroughbreds of the modern foxhunt.¹² His horses were a miscellaneous

assortment of Galloway nags, Irish hobbies, High Almain, Flanders, Friesland, and homebreds. Perhaps also a Spanish jennet, "finelie made both head, bodie, and legs . . . for his lightnesse, and swiftnesse withall . . . verie much esteemed, and especiallie of noble men;"¹⁸ a Turk, "though not verie great nor strong made, yet verie light and swift in their running and of great courage;"¹⁴ or a Neapolitan, known for "their comelie shape, their strength, their courage, their sure footmanship, their well-reigning, their lofty pace, their cleane tothing, their strong galloping and their swift running."¹⁵

Contemporary opinion attests the staying powers of the wiry Galloway¹⁶ and the Irish hobby, so-called from the old native name *Haubini*, "so light and swift, notwithstanding . . . somewhat skittish and fearful."¹⁷ But the High Almain, Flanders, and Friesland were clumsy and slow for hunting. The homebred jades were of mixed and undistinguished breeding, full of "jades' tricks; which are their own right by the law of nature."¹⁸ Some of the assembly, mounted and

roused in their seats,
Their neighing coursers daring of the spur,¹⁹
Till, like a jade, Self-will himself must tire.²⁰

may have found their mounts, though full of pride and mettle at the outset, soon winded. Like Lust, according to the sorrowful Lucrece:

While Lust is in his pride, no exclamation
Can curb his heat or rein his rash desire,

The unskilful rider, too fond of the spur, and too forward in the chase, might find himself "jaded out of the field,"²¹ to reflect wanly, like gloomy King Henry:

Find we a time for frightened peace to pant,
And breathe short-winded accents of new broils²²

and to complain, with Grumio, "Fie, fie, on all tired jades, on all mad masters, on all foul ways."²³ Sustained running over rough country was beyond many of these horses: "Eight yards of uneven ground is threescore and ten miles afoot with me,"²⁴ says Falstaff. "If I travel but four foot by the squier further afoot, I shall break my wind."²⁵

Polonius, never wind-broken himself, admonishes Ophelia :

Tender yourself more dearly,
Or — not to crack the wind of the poor phrase,
Running it thus — you'll tender me a fool.²⁶

Of the variety of horses likely to be found, Blundeville says :

Some men have a breed of Great Horses, meete for warre and to serve in the field Others have ambling hoises of a meane stature for to journey and travel by the waie Some again have a race of swift runners to run for wagers or to gallop the buck ²⁷

And Professor Ridgeway :

Topsall writing in the sixteenth century is . . . perfectly correct in stating that "Brittaine breedeth little horses and amblers" ²⁸

If the gentleman hunter were a connoisseur of horseflesh, and if he were wealthy enough,²⁹ he probably owned a prized Barbary or two, "of unimproved mettle hot and full,"³⁰ which gave spirit to the assembly, even as John of Lancaster at the Battle of Shrewsbury, of whom Prince Hal exclaims :

O, this boy
Lends mettle to us all!³¹

and as Lady Macbeth, who spurs the faltering purpose of Macbeth until he declares :

Bring forth men children only;
For thy undaunted mettle should compose
Nothing but males.³²

In the shift of emphasis from heavy to light horse breeding, the Eastern horse was an all-important influence. It had long been (and still is) representative of superiority in conformation, speed, and endurance. The Barbary was a North African desert horse; according to Professor Ridgeway, the Libyan desert furnished the foundation stock for Egyptian, Arabian, and all other Eastern horses; it influenced Italian and Spanish horses, and by early crossing on Scotch and Irish stock was responsible for the spirit of the Galloway and the Irish Hobby.

The Barbary was esteemed by Shakspeare. Recall Rich-

ard's favorite horse, "roan Barbary,"³³ twice mentioned in *Richard II*, and Claudius's wager of six Barbary horses.³⁴ As to colors, Blundeville says:

The colours depend on the preponderance of the elements . . . when he doth participate in all the four elements, equally and in due proportion, then is he perfect and most commonly shall be one of the coulours following. That is to say, a browne baye, a dapple graye, a blacke full of silver heares, a blacke lyke a moore, or a fayre rone, which kinds of horses are most recommendable, most temperate, strongest, and of genteldest nature. And next to these are such as be most like in colour to them: as the bright bay, the darke baye, that hath neyther learing looke, mealy nose, nor white flanke³⁵

"A fayre rone:" Hotspur's horse is "a roan, a crop-ear," and the Dauphin's "of the colour of the nutmeg and of the heat of the ginger."³⁷ Of other approved colors, Timon rides "a bay courser,"³⁸ Lefeu speaks of "bay Curtal and his furniture,"³⁹ and Edgar has been

proud of heart, to ride on
a bay trotting horse over four-inched bridges⁴⁰

Blundeville distinguishes between a "black lyke a moore" and the black which indicates that earth, hence dullness, is predominant in the makeup.⁴¹ Since the Elizabethans used the term "black" loosely, the precise distinction is not clear; if it were, it might throw light on the vexing question of the color of Othello. However, Timon instructs Tamora to provide herself with "two proper palfreys, black as jet."⁴²

White, indicating preponderance of air, meant a horse "phlegmatic, slow, dull, and apt to lose flesh."⁴³ Yet Lord Lucius presents Timon with "four milk-white horses;"⁴⁴ Lavinia's horse is a "snow-white goodly steed,"⁴⁵ probably a symbol of innocence; and Richard's is "white Surrey."⁴⁶ The Jailer's mad daughter sings, "He's buy me a white Cut, forth for to ride."⁴⁷ Sir Andrew Aguecheek's "grey Capilet"⁴⁸ is not, I surmise, a dappled gray, but rather a variety of white. Of dun, an off color, Shakspeare's only mention is:

Tut, dun's the mouse, the constable's own word.
If thou art Dun, we'll draw thee from the mire
Of this sir-reverence love, wherein thou stickest
Up to the ears.⁴⁹

The prevailing colors of the Barbary horse today are dark bay, brown, chestnut, black, and grey. If they were so then,⁵⁰ as there is no reason to doubt, since the Eastern horse had, by Shakspeare's time, been bred for 1500 years or more, one speculates as to the origin of the *roan* Barb. Perhaps it was off color, it was sold out of the native stud; perhaps it was a cross-bred. The chestnut as a prevailing color gives some point to the question of the Jailer's daughter: "You know the Chestnut Mare the Duke has?"⁵¹

Of markings, Blundeville says:

It is an excellent good mark also that a horse have a white star in his forehead, or a white list or fillet coming down on his head without touching his brow, and not fully arriving to his nose⁵²

Shakspeare recognizes the blemish of a dark spot, rather than a white star between the eyes:

Eno. Will Cæsar weep?

Ag. He has a cloud in's face.

Eno. He were the worse for that, were he a horse;

So is he, being a man⁵³

This brief survey encompasses but a small fraction of Shakspeare's allusions. It may nevertheless show that he had an eye for a horse, that he knew the creak and smell of saddle leather, and, feet in stirrups, the exhilarating lift all horsemen know.

*Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana.*

¹*The Diary of Master William Silence.* D H Madden Longmans. 1897. One of the most readable books on Shakspeare's allusions to venery and horsemanship.

²*Holinshead's Chronicles*, Ed. 1840 Vol VI, p. 3.

³One statute of Henry VIII, for example (1541 32 Hy VIII), stipulated that in some twenty-six shires no stallion under 15 hands was to be used for breeding. Such a size, though smaller than the modern draft, which reaches 16-17½ hands, was larger than the native stock, and than Oriental light horses, which even today rarely exceed 14½ hands.

⁴*Henry VI V*, 2, 12. According to the N. E. D. "In earlier Eng. it (bonny) appears to have often had the sense Of fine size, big (as a good quality)."

⁵*Venus and Adonis* 295-98.

Round-hoof'd, short-jointed, fetlocks shag and long.
Broad breast, full eye, small head and nostrils wide,
High crest, short ears, straight legs and passing strong,
Thin mane, thick tail, broad buttock, tender hide.

These lines, and also 271-76, are the focus of Professor Carleton Brown's contention that the catalogue of points of a horse was traditional and stereotyped, stemming from

the Latin of Columella, Palladius, and others. He contends that, though Shakspeare, as a countryman, may have had first-hand experience with horses, the similarity of the above description to Elizabethan texts (chiefly *Batman uppon Bartholome*, Google's *Four Booke of Husbandry* and Blundeville's *Art of Ryding and Fower chiefst offices belongyng to Horsemanshippe*, all of which echo the classic writers) is too noticeable to be accidental. Cf *Shakespeare and the Horse* Carleton Brown *The Library* Third Series Volume III 1912 pp 152-180

⁶Cf *Midsummer Night's Dream* I, 2, 34. *Richard II*, I, 3, 136 III, 3, 56 *1 Henry IV* I, 1, 12 *Henry V*. IV, 8, 114. *Richard III*. V, 3, 93. *Hamlet*. III, 1, 62 *King John* V, 7, 117

⁷*Venus and Adonis*. 31 Cf 261, 403 Of "courser" as a heavy war horse, Cf. 2 *Henry IV* IV, 1, 119 *Henry V*. III, 7, 47. 3 *Henry VI* V, 7, 9 *Antony and Cleopatra* I, 2, 22 *Pericles* II, 1, 164. However, Timon's "bay courser" (*Timon of Athens*. I, 2, 217) probably, and Iago's "coursers for cousins" (*Othello* I, 1, 113) certainly refer to light horses

⁸During the reign of Elizabeth there were no prescribed race courses or laws governing racing; however, a popular sport was individual match racing; for example, the "wild goose chase" over hazardous country, the rider behind being compelled to follow the leader (Cf *Romeo and Juliet*. II, 4, 75). Systematic racing was introduced by James I, developed by Charles I, much more so by Charles II, to whose time may be traced the origin of the modern Thoroughbred.

⁹Sonnet XCI 1-4

¹⁰*Much Ado About Nothing* III, 4, 53-5.

¹¹*Canterbury Tales* Prologue 177-8

¹²The English Thoroughbred (of which the modern hunter is a variety), most popular and successful light horse breed in the western world, is the result of crossing Barbary, Turkish, and Arabian stallions on the lighter native mares. Shakspeare knew and admired the Barbary; the Turk (a name often loosely applied to Eastern horses, some of which may have been of Arabian origin) was known in England by 1589, at least, though Shakspeare does not mention it, the Arabian, however, was not introduced before 1616

¹³Blundeville. Quoted from *The Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse*. William Ridgeway Cambridge 1905 p. 259.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 189

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 189

¹⁶"A small horse (originally of a breed cultivated in Galloway, Scotland) . . . between 13 and 15 hands high, showing activity and endurance under strain" *Thoroughbred Bloodlines* John F Wall 1939 p 3. However, Schmidt's *Shakespeare-Lexicon* definition of "common hackneys," hence horses to be regarded with some contempt by the discriminating, gives point to Pistol's slurring remark: "Know we not Galloway nags?" (*2 Henry IV*. II, 4, 205). King Henry uses "common-hackney'd" as a term of reproach to Prince Hal. (*1 Henry IV*. III, 2, 40)

¹⁷Blundeville Quoted from Ridgeway, p 388.

¹⁸*All's Well That Ends Well* IV, 5, 64-5

¹⁹*2 Henry IV*. IV, 1, 117-19

²⁰*Lucrece*. 705-8.

²¹*Antony and Cleopatra* III, 1, 34

²²*1 Henry IV*. I, 1, 2-3

²³*Taming of the Shrew*. IV, 1, 1 "Jade," both as substantive and verb, is a frequent image with Shakspeare Petruchio's horse (*Shrew*. III, 2, 49-65) is the ultimate in jades, a sad collection of unsoundness which must have been all too prevalent in Elizabethan horses

²⁴*1 Henry IV* II, 2, 27-8

²⁵*1 Henry IV*. II, 2, 12-14

²⁶*Hamlet*. I, 3, 107-9.

²⁷Quoted from *The Great Horse*. Sir Walter Gilbey, Bat. 1899. p. 31.

²⁸*The Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse*. Cambridge. 1905. p 361. The amble was an artificial gait, in which the horse moved simultaneously the fore and hind legs on each side, as in the pace. (Modern zoologists, however, incline to the belief that the pace was the natural gait of the prehistoric horse) A moderate, easy gait, it made amblers preferred of women and probably of unskilful riders

Chaucer's Wife of Bath and Clerk ride Amblers. On the other hand, ambling was too gentle and mannered for the more forthright, who regarded it with contempt. Hence Hamlet's "you jig, you amble, and you lisp" (*Hamlet*. III, 1, 149-50); Gloucester's "wanton ambling nymph" (*Richard III*. I, 1, 17). Cf *Romeo and Juliet* I, 4, 11; 1 *Henry IV*. III, 2, 60-1.

²⁹"James imported from the Orient . . . an Arabian Stallion for which he paid five hundred pounds" *Types and Breeds of Farm Animals*. Charles S Plub 1920

³⁰*Hamlet*. I, 7, 96

³¹1 *Henry IV*. V, 4, 24-5.

³²*Macbeth*. I, 7, 7-5 "Mettle," according to the N. E. D.: "Of a horse, and occasionally of other animals" occurs often in Shakspeare.

³³*Richard II*. V, 5, 78 81.

³⁴*Hamlet*. V, 2, 155, 168.

³⁵Ridgeway. Op. cit pp. 371-2.

³⁶1 *Henry IV*. II, 3, 72.

³⁷*Henry V* III 7, 20-1. The Dauphin's horse is the most spirited in Shakspeare: "le cheval volant, the Pegasus . . . he trots the air; the earth sings when he touches it . . . pure air and fire" and so on for half the scene.

³⁸*Timon of Athens* I, 2, 216

³⁹*All's Well That Ends Well* II, 3, 65.

⁴⁰*Lea*. III, 4, 54-5.

⁴¹"If earth preponderates, then is he dull and black and russet. For if he have more of the earth than the rest, he is melancholly, heavy and faint-hearted, and of colour a blacke, a Russet, bright or dark donne." Ridgeway. Op. cit

⁴²*Titus Andronicus*. V, 2, 50

⁴³Blundeville. Ridgeway Op Cit

⁴⁴*Timon of Athens* I, 2, 185

⁴⁵*Titus Andronicus* II, 3, 76

⁴⁶*Richard III* V, 2, 8

⁴⁷*The Two Noble Kinsmen*. III, 4, 22. N. E. D.: "A familiar expression for a common or labouring horse," hence suited to such a person of low degree.

⁴⁸*Twelfth Night*. III, 4, 315. As to white horses, Professor Carleton Brown says (*Op cit*, p 165): "Certainly, to judge from the romances, the favorite colour of the horse in the Middle Ages was white." However, white horses, though popular in pictures and in literature, have not achieved as many dramatic rôles as painters and writers would have us believe. Useful in ceremonials, they were supplanted in the field and on the race course by darker colors, chiefly varieties of the bay. However, among the Arabs solid white is prized, though rarely found. Concerning color, a pertinent comment is quoted by Sir Walter Gilbey (*Op. cit*, pp. 17-18) from the list of horses killed at the battle of Falkirk, 1298: ". . . a black horse, 24 marks . . . a white pied charger value 60 marks . . . a black hackney charged with a white hind foot value 100 marks . . ."

⁴⁹*Romeo and Juliet*. I, 4, 40-4 "To draw dun out of the mire was a rural pastime, in which *Dun* meant a dun horse, supposed to be stuck in the mire and sometimes represented by one who played"

⁵⁰Cf The reference to black Othello as "a Barbary horse." (*Othello*. I, 1, 112.) Thus, "gennets for germans," line 114, has more point when it is remembered that the Barbary horse was an influence in the breeding of the Spanish jennet.

⁵¹*The Two Noble Kinsmen*. V, 2, 83-4.

⁵²Ridgeway. p. 373

⁵³*Antony and Cleopatra*. III, 2, 51-2.

AN AGNOSTIC LIFE OF SHAKSPERE

By ROBERT M. SMITH

I.

*THE LIFE AND ART OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE*¹ by Professor Hazleton Spencer of Johns Hopkins, a sound scholar carefully trained in the exacting disciplines of Professor Kittredge's school of historical criticism, is a most scrupulously fairminded and straightforward account of the facts about Shakspeare and his art. Because Professor Spencer eschews the J. Dover Wilson fashion of wild conjecture and imaginative flight, he provides a salutary check to the excesses still invading Shakspeare criticism. With neither Baconians nor the more popular Oxfordians will he enter a race, not even as a spectator to venture a dollar. So far as is humanly possible for a lover of Shakspeare, he sticks to the facts and the external evidences, carefully discriminating between external and internal evidence, between tradition, legend, and gossip, and after weighing the possibilities and the probabilities, nearly always concludes with the tantalizing but honest deduction: "we do not know," "no one knows," "we can not know." His first chapter, which is devoted to Shakspeare's career may, therefore, be appropriately entitled "an agnostic life of Shakspeare."

What are all of these many important and perennial questions that in Spencer's opinion have no answers? What are these things that we do not know and cannot know? A comparison of Professor J. Q. Adams's biography, which appeared seventeen years ago, with the present work, will serve not only to reveal them but to illustrate the important differences in temper and tone between the two biographers. Adams undoubtedly remains the only biographer who can make a life of Shakspeare readable and exciting. With Adams, Shakspeare's life becomes a romantic adventure. On the contrary, the general reader and the undergraduate student who are making first excursions into Shakspeare biography will find Spencer's first chapter exceedingly hard going, because it is so condensed and packed with fact, and with the scholarly weighing of evidences. On the other hand,

because Adams is so confident that he has the final answers where Spencer is prevailingly tentative and sceptical, the student will find less enjoyment, but a more cautious guide in Spencer.

Both critics, however, are on common ground in sharing the belief that Shakspeare's private life and opinions cannot be extracted from his plays; both agree with Sir Sidney Lee that Shakspeare did not wear his heart on his sleeve—not even in the *Sonnets*. Both belong, therefore, to what Professor Brewster has termed "the low significance school" rather than to the Dowden-Brandes "high significance school."

But within these objective confines when we compare further we discover that Adams is a yea-sayer and Spencer a nay-sayer. Professor Spencer's agnosticisism is all-pervading: We cannot explain Shakspeare by his Stratford environment. We do not know certainly that John Shakspeare was Shakspeare's father, or whether Richard Shakspeare was his grandfather. "We shall never know" what part Shakspeare's mother, Mary Arden, played in influencing the mind of her son. Professor Spencer fails to mention or to stress the fact that his mother was a Catholic, or to share Professor Parrott's reasonable conjecture that Shakspeare's general spirit of religious tolerance may well be derived from the presence in the family of both Protestant and Catholic persuasions. About Shakspeare's boyhood "we know nothing," though the imagery of the Stratford countryside "encourages the supposition that he loved the woods and fields and ranged them with an observant eye." One-eighth of the metaphors and similes in *Venus and Adonis* seem to be drawn from the poet's direct observation, two and a half times the number derived from books.

We do not know who taught Shakspeare at grammar school, nor how long his formal education continued. We do not know what Shakspeare thought of love, since he expressed every variety of it, nor do we know whether Shakspeare's marriage with Ann Hathaway was happy or not. English authorities, like Lee and Chambers, usually conclude that

there was something painful and irregular in it; Adams, following Gray, goes to great lengths to show that there was nothing irregular in the union; moreover, that Shakspeare was a loving and exemplary husband all his days—even taking his family with him to London, and thoughtfully providing in his will that Ann should have “the second best bed”—the first best bed being for guests and, therefore, never occupied by the happy pair. Although Spencer concurs with Adams on “the second best bed,” he maintains that what contact (if any) Shakspeare kept with his family from 1586 to 1596, during his early years in London, “is quite unknown,” though everything points to his family’s having remained in Stratford (p. 17). He passes over Adams’s interesting inference from the amount of taxes which Shakspeare paid in London that the poet had his family with him. Like Adams, but unlike many critics, he fortunately does not cite here the passages in *The Tempest*, and *Twelfth Night* censuring irregular intercourse. In such matters Adams tends to draw Shakspeare, if not as a Puritan, at least, as a sober and righteous citizen, and even omits entirely the Manningham story. Spencer includes it in the belief that it is too much to suppose that the poet had no love affairs in London, but he does not, like so many Puritan critics, employ the 129th sonnet to proclaim that Shakspeare’s spirit was expended in a waste of shame, or indulge in lurid fancies about Mary Fitton and “the dark lady,” or conclude with Frank Harris that the plays reveal a soul consumed with the corrosive canker of sensuality. Shakspeare was, indeed, like other Renaissance youth, a gay liver who enjoyed the convivialities of good company over the cups of canary and sherris sack, had an eye for feminine beauty, but was neither a sot nor a lecher. The plays could have been written by neither. With less reason Spencer leans in Adams’s direction in crediting, though tentatively, the gossip of Vicard Ward that Shakspeare’s death resulted from a merry drinking bout with Drayton and Jonson.

“No one knows,” moreover, whether the poaching story of Davies and Rowe is true. Adams goes to great length to absolve Shakspeare entirely by showing that Sir Thomas Lucy never had a deer park. Spencer likewise will not let Shakspeare steal a deer. Nor is Justice Shallow a satire on

Lucy. That a London audience could have identified Shallow as Lucy is incredible, and Hotson's fantastic attempt to identify Shallow as Gardiner, the Bankside J. P., is even less credible. The "horseboy" story is in the same category. "There is nothing," says the sceptical Spencer a trifle wearily, "for a biographer to do but rehearse these stories. Any of them may be true. All of them may be false." Only one fact about these early years is certain: that after c. 1585 he was in London.

Professor Spencer similarly will allow himself no dogmatism, not even a conjecture, as to the acting Company Shakspeare associated himself with during the apprentice years 1587-1594. The generally accepted view of Lee and Baldwin is that Shakspeare followed the Earl of Leicester's company to London about 1585, became a full member and shareholder in 1594 and was continuously associated with it thereafter. Adams, however, on the evidences of early Shaksperian plays in the possession of the Earl of Pembroke's players ingeniously champions Pembroke. We know that Southampton was Shakspeare's patron but not for how long. D'avenant's estimate that the Earl once gave him a thousand pounds is "an incredibly tall figure." Nor do we know when Shakspeare began or stopped writing sonnets. None of the many schemes for arranging the sonnets, or dating them, or ascribing names to 'the friend', 'the rival poet', or 'the dark lady' are convincing. The meaning of Thorpe's dedication to Mr. W. H. also "remains unpenetrated." On the whole, Spencer holds with Adams that Shakspeare was chiefly responding to the Petrarchan fashion set by Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* (1591). The *Sonnets*, he wisely concludes, will remain a puzzle for scholars and cranks unless further external evidence is turned up.

The theory which most of us have been teaching to our students for years that Shakspeare began playwriting in collaboration with leading dramatists Spencer says has been abandoned—though he does not tell by whom, or how, or why? He still clings (p. 37) to Seneca as the prime inspiration of the Elizabethan tragedy-of-blood, though this hoary view has been seriously challenged recently by Willard Farnam in *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Drama*,

1936 (also in the Bibliography), and by Howard Baker in his *Induction to Tragedy*. He does not, however, partake in the squeamishness of critics who deny *Titus Andronicus* to Shakspeare on æsthetic grounds.

In pointing out with discernment Shakspeare's lack of case in critical comedy, and his refusal to follow Jonson's lead in writing comedies of humour, Spencer tends, perhaps, to underestimate the humours and the satires of lowly types that are present beginning with the *Henry IV* series, and continuing through the *Merry Wives*, and the so-called problem comedies, namely, from such figures as Falstaff's companions to Pompey and Mistress Overdone. I fancy some scholar some day will bring out a good dissertation on Ben Jonson's influence on Shakspeare.

Shakspeare was not, as Spencer alleges, "a long time" finding his true vein of comedy. *Love's Labours Lost*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Midsummer Night's Dream*, written within the space of a very few years, clearly show that, though he experimented with other types, he was at home from the first in the romantic Euphuistic comedy of the Lyly-Greene variety, a vein he steadily worked with increasing riches until the end of the century.

One of the most needful caveats, which Spencer's cool scepticism keeps him repeating, is against "putting our finger on a passage and saying, 'This is what Shakspeare really thought.'" (p. 44). "If the poet had a religious life, he kept it to himself, as far as surviving evidence goes." This is putting the case perhaps a little too strongly. Lee and Cumberland Clark demonstrate how every evidence goes to show that Shakspeare was in good standing with the Anglican church from baptism to burial; that whatever may have been his own private thoughts or beliefs—and there is no doubt that they ranged freely in the manner of Montaigne and in the fashion of Renaissance scepticism over every conceivable problem—he was outwardly a conformist. Nor should we be led astray by such late traditions as those of Davies, and conclude with Chambers that Shakspeare "dyed a papist." Spencer is quite right, however, in insisting that Shakspeare's tragedies "are not resigned like the tragedies of

Sophocles. They are not Christian. They are not meek. They are not full of hope, despite their vindication of the noble fortitude of which the human spirit is capable." In spite of Lytton Strachey's essay, *Shakespeare's Final Period*, Spencer inclines to accept "the new and serene mood" of the last plays and days. Here he comes perilously near practising the fallacy against which he preaches when he cites Prospero's speech (p. 75) about "the cloud-capped towers, etc." as evidence that Shakspeare found not only the world of shadow, but the world of phenomena, as well as that of the spirit, a great flux in which "Our little life is rounded with a sleep." Apparently no Shakspeare critic, however objective he may strive to be, can wholly resist putting his finger on a passage and saying: "This is what Shakspeare really thought." Spencer's main tenet, however, is worth observing; as Shakspeare critics in a world gone mad with fanatics, we should indulge in "personal significance" as little as possible.

Spencer refuses consent to Tannenbaum's demonstration of Collier's forged Revels accounts, but agrees with him on the good penmanship of the poet. He also agrees with Tucker Brooke that Shakspeare's political sympathies were with the established order. Though he was not a Fascist, he was a conservative Little Englander who took little interest either in the New World of geographical exploration or of science. Shakspeare has of late been damned by some Communists for being a stupid, petty bourgeois, but also as ardently claimed by others as true to the party line and the popular front. Spencer puts the proper quietus on all such mongering when he observes that "anyone who is naive or unscrupulous enough to select materials for a pattern of half-truths can find in Shakespeare enough to prove anything he pleases. It is to the credit of Spencer that he avoids so generally these pitfalls, and emerges a safe and sound, if laborious, pilot through the mazes of Shakspeare biography.

II.

PROFESSOR SPENCER'S Chapters 3-II on Shakspeare's plays, like his biography, are better adapted to students in graduate seminars than to undergraduates

or general readers. Behind the mass of historical fact is an enthusiastic critic possessing common sense, acumen, and taste, and much delight in the nuances of Shakespeare's dramatic art, but unfortunately the conscientious historical scholar too often overcomes the critic and sacrifices interpretation to prolonged discussions of title, date, source, quarto and folio text and their relationships. Since this factual matter has little or no interest, rightly or wrongly, for undergraduates and general readers, Spencer would have written a far more readable book had he placed these recondite matters with his notes at the back in fine type, and devoted the space thus saved to critical discussions of general interest. For the special student and scholar, however, the book is especially valuable as a convenient summary of modern research and opinion; moreover the condensed theatrical history of each play is an especially welcome contribution not readily available elsewhere.

Before passing to critical disagreements, let me call attention to some excellent passages of critical insight. First is Spencer's refusal to traffic with "the disintegrators," Robertson, Dover Wilson, *et al.*, against whom students in these days of mangled and perverse editions need special warning:

"In general, the disintegrators fall into two main groups: absolvers of Shakespeare by ascribing inferior portions of his plays to other pens," (Robertson) "and explainers-away of harmless textual inconsistencies by hypothetical revision which Shakespeare is alleged to have made on a very large scale both in adapting plays by other authors and in revamping from time to time earlier pieces of his own" (Wilson)

His finely balanced interpretation of Falstaff (pp. 180 ff) steers shrewdly between the sympathetic excesses of Morgann and Bradley and the Puritan denunciations of Fripp, who was apparently incapable of laughing with Shakspeare over Falstaff. Of equal excellence is his paragraph on the character of King Henry IV (p. 188), and his full enjoyment and understanding of the tavern scenes in *Henry IV*, Part II (p. 192), as well as his condemnation of the "critical follies" that "look for a tragic flaw in the lovers" (Romeo and Juliet) or "wring a moral lesson out

of their bitter death" (p. 221); also his strictures on sentimentalizing Shylock, and his protests against smothering *Mid-Summer Night's Dream* on the stage with "gilded steam-radiator raiment." Few will be inclined to carp either with his wholesouled worship of Portia as "the pearl of heroines" (p. 293)—though Rosalind's gay wit behind the coffee pot at breakfast would wear better than Portia's tedious moralizings over good deeds shining in a naughty world. Under the guidance of W. W. Lawrence's *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, Spencer also steers a sensible course, especially in the treatment of Helena in *All's Well that Ends Well*. *Cymbeline*, the favorite of poets, comes in for resolute damning, and *The Winter's Tale*, a romance too much neglected, for as resolute praise.

Every Shakspeare critic has a few special axes to swing. One of Spencer's well-placed cuts is at the Donne faddists recently led by T. S. Eliot. Spencer restores the balance by calling Donne "a once neglected but lately overrated poet," and adds that "his somewhat artificially stimulated twentieth century reputation has long passed its peak." For this relief much thanks.

A more serious issue is Spencer's renewed effort to fell the sturdy tree of traditional Hamlet interpretation. Following the lead of Professor Kittredge (*Shakspeare*, 1916), a succession of his pupils in recent years have endeavored to demolish the Goethe-Schlegel-Coleridge-Bradley-Adams School by denying a tragic flaw in the hero, and thus removing the play from the plane of high tragedy. In 1918 Howard Mumford Jones endeavored to persuade us that Claudius rather than Hamlet was the proper man (*The King in Hamlet*). Three years later came Elmer E. Stoll's study of Hamlet in relation to Elizabethan and Jacobean stage traditions and conventions. Hamlet ceased to be the "muddy-mettled rascal" unpregnant of his cause, and appeared as the active hero of a traditional revenge-ghost melodrama (as originated by Kyd), an intrepid prince who killed the King at the right moment when all the proofs of guilt were in, only to lose his own life by treachery. W. Roy Mackenzie in 1922 published an uncompleted study *Hamlet as a Man of Action*. R. W. Babcock in *The Genesis of Shake-*

speare Idolatry (1931) endeavored to prove that the troubled soul of Hamlet had its origin in eighteenth century criticism. Spencer first entered the lists in *Shakespeare Improved* (1927), with the assertion: "If Hamlet is not a tragedy of external circumstance, there never was one," and interpreted the Prince as "a sweet high-minded boy who faces a fearful task like a gentleman." J. W. Draper's *The Hamlet of Shakespeare's Audience*, 1938 (not in Spencer's Bibliography), the most important volume of Hamlet interpretation since Dover Wilson's, *What Happens in Hamlet*, offers the most complete argument for this, shall we call it, *Harvard* interpretation of Hamlet? Spencer returns to the attack in the present work.

It is high time, therefore, that this trend be countered before it settles into a new orthodoxy which leaves the soul of Hamlet, or one half of him, and the half that has always been most fascinating, out of the play altogether. These critics do not try to pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery, because they deny that Hamlet has any mystery at all, in spite of Hamlet's repeated assertions that he has "that within which passeth show." In defiance of the text, they deny that Hamlet procrastinates at all. Surely Hamlet should know himself better than his critics; he not only procrastin-

ates, but repeatedly upbraids himself for this fault of delay. These critics, however, discount or ignore the soliloquies; Spencer dismisses them as "arias" rather than authentic character revelations. Yet Professor Kittredge writes: "Are not Hamlet's soliloquies sincere?—Each of these speeches is in equal measure the outbreak of the person's character." (*S. A. B.* XI, 173). Hamlet plainly summarizes his internal difficulty in the immortal lines:

"And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sickli'd o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry
And lose the name of action."

Why, if "Claudius is his own scourge, a daily one" (p. 81), may not Hamlet be, as he patently announces himself to be, *his own scourge*? It is clear that he is reproaching himself

again when he refers to "thinking too precisely on the event" and when he says:

"I do not know
Why yet I live to say 'this thing's to do,'
Sith I have cause, and will, and strength, and means,
To do 't"

Moreover, correctly surmising why his father's spirit has returned, he exclaims:

"Do you not come your tardy son to chide,
That, laps'd in time and passion, lets go by
The important acting of your dread command?
O, say!
Ghost. Do not forget: this visitation
Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose."

This key passage, not in soliloquy, Spencer lightly dismisses "as of no moment" (p. 316). Spencer here should heed the warning against the excessive use of the historical method which he has signalled to Stoll in the case of Falstaff: "the score itself forbids; and all historical criticism must rest on score reading." (p. 401). Let the Harvard critics return to the score.

To interpret the play by ignoring passages disclosing the soul of Hamlet; to turn it, as in the Maurice Evans production into an external tragedy of fate and blood revenge, of chance and environment, is to rob the tragedy of its universal significance and remove it from its rightful place as high tragedy in which a hero contends mightily against outward obstacles, but through inner tragic frailty contributes to his disaster. Being high-minded and well-intentioned—"like ourselves but greater"—he suffers more than he deserves and therefore elicits our awe, pity, and admiration. The truth of the matter, as in all great tragedies, is that in Hamlet we have the clash of character and environment—the hero struggling both with himself and with the hostile world.

Extremists of the Romantic or Subjective School have turned the play into the soul problem of Hamlet; the 'Harvard' Objective School, by centering attention on the play in relation to its age, has tried to solve by elimination the

mystery of Hamlet's inner struggle. Against the extremes of both schools Lewis Campbell's passage from *Tragic Drama in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Shakespeare* (1904), may serve as the necessary corrective:

"Tragedy does not consist, then, either of tragic situation alone nor of character study alone, but the action of character on situation, and of situation upon character. Character is destiny only in the sense that in other circumstances the possibilities of evil which for the time have triumphed might have been overruled by still greater possibilities of good. The character does not have certain elements that predestine him to doom whether or no. The pity of it combined with the horror and awe turns upon our conviction that in *other circumstances* the possibilities of evil might have been overcome.

Place Hamlet somewhere else than in the Danish court, let him succeed to the peaceful possession of a throne, give him worthy subjects of his love and reverence, and adequate leverage for beneficent activity, and the splendid powers of action which come out spasmodically in foiling the plot against his life, in his manipulation of the players to his purpose of discovery and his final vindication to the right, would have secured to him the happiness, the popularity, and the outward success which his inherent nobleness deserved. The strain of passionateness which, being suppressed and thwarted, breaks out so as to ruin his main design would have been the spring of great achievements; the inspiration of high and daring deeds. His deep thoughts, his penetrating insight, his far reaching speculative vein, which, as it is, are all turned inwards and lose the name of action, might then have found free range and scope as to be full of blessing. When this is ignored, he is regarded as a born dreamer, for whom, as for Coleridge, the very name of duty paralyses the will. Such a personality would be less than tragic." (pp. 46-47).

Another danger in the "historical" interpretation of Hamlet as a man of action lurks in the assumption that generalizations upon fragmentary data of the age can tell us how the contemporary audience interpreted Hamlet; moreover, Draper seems to be insisting that *our* interpretations to be sound must be kept within the confines of these "historical" fictions—as if Shakspeare were drawing only modes, types and fashions rather than men and women. The melancholy Dane did not originate in 18th century criticism, but in Shakspeare's text, and generations of readers have found themselves endeared to Hamlet because of the many universal truths of human nature he reveals. Even Ben Jonson, the expert on fashions and 'humours', understood this truth when he penned the greatest critical estimate ever

made of his friend: "He was not for an age but for all time." There is no obligation whatever, therefore, upon anyone to confine his interpretation of Hamlet within the prescriptions of what Stoll, Draper, or Spencer fancy that age thought of Hamlet. Obviously neither they nor anyone else can wisely dogmatize about it. The historical estimate, to be sure, has proved a valuable and necessary corrective to the irresponsible vagaries of Hamlet criticism, and to the excesses of the Romantic school who see nothing in the play but psychological problems of the hero, but it is not necessary to swing to the other extreme, turn the play into flashy melodrama, and rattle off the soliloquies in Maurice Evans's fashion like an impatient school boy in a hurry to be off to the cricket field. Even Spencer himself is not satisfied by Evans's playing the lead as a "pleasant chatty young man instead of the tragic prince." The interpretation of J. Q. Adams, and the performance of John Gielgud, therefore, remain better interpretations of Hamlet than the studies of the 'Harvard' school which insist on Hamlet with the soul of Hamlet left out.

Professor Spencer's exegesis of *Othello* will serve as an answer to Stoll's ineffectual endeavors to persuade us that the tragedy is a disjointed melodrama, and Othello a preposterous mad fellow devoid of psychological truth. Draper, however, in his excellent studies of this play (see especially, *Captain General Othello*, Anglia XLIII, 296 *et seq.*) has refuted Spencer's contention that Iago's claim to promotion is stronger than Cassio's. Cassio's soldiership was modern, Iago's old-style; moreover to believe Iago's accusation that Cassio "never set a squadron in the field, etc.", is to be sucked in by Iago's jealous detraction and overlook his later statement that Cassio "is a soldier fit to stand by Caesar and give direction." Obviously Othello knew perfectly what he was doing in making the promotion; nor does he ever give any intimation to the contrary. Lodovico shows the same confidence when he delivers Cyprus to the care of Cassio at the end of the play.

Furthermore Othello is not "blameless." (p. 321). If he were, he would lose tragic proportion and become merely the innocent victim. Though he is "fallen in the practise

of a damned slave" and is much more sinned against than sinning, he is not free from the excess of a virtue, which in tragedy is as effective as a vice in bringing disaster. With unerring accuracy Iago reiterates this flaw, which Brutus and Hamlet also share with Othello:

- Cassius.* "Well, Brutus, thou art noble; yet I see
Thy honorable mettle may be wrought
From that it is dispos'd: therefore 'tis meet
That noble minds keep ever with their likes;
For who so firm that cannot be seduced? (I.2, 10-14)
- Iago.* "The Moor is of a free and open nature
That thinks men honest that but seem to be so,
And will as tenderly be led by th' nose
As asses are. (I.3, 369-70, also II.1, 297-8)
- Claudius* "he [Hamlet], being remiss,
Most generous, and free from all contriving,
Will not peruse the foils." (IV.7, 135-7)

This excess of highmindedness in the cases of Brutus and Othello is accompanied by the fatal flaw of witlessness, a lack of perception, just as surely contributing to their downfall. Finally, as G. R. Elliot in "Othello as Love-Tragedy" (*American Review*, Jan. 1937) has acutely discerned, Othello's passionate love until Act V is wholly self-absorbing, possessive, and full of intense self-concern; he does not achieve the patience of unselfish love, until he turns judge upon himself, and "through self-damnation (V.2, 259ff) finds his way of purgation." Then his passion is lifted; he has come to see Desdemona's "visage in her mind, her inmost as well as her outward beauty; and his heart's "subdued" to her very quality.

May we not look forward to another book from Spencer when with a more judicious use of his historical equipment he brings his critical insight and zest to dwell more fully on Shakspeare not as the fiction of history, "but the Representation of Life"?

*Lehigh University,
Bethlehem, Pa.*

¹Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1940.

SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS IN THE RICHMOND THEATRE, 1819-1838

By MARTIN STAPLES SHOCKLEY

FOR eight years after the famous theatre fire of 1811 the city of Richmond, Virginia, was without a theatre. On June 11, 1819, was opened a new theatre which continued intermittently for nineteen years, until November 14, 1838, when The Marshall Theatre was opened.¹ Files of Richmond newspapers covering the years 1819-38 make possible a reasonably accurate and dependable survey of theatrical performances during this period.²

Newspaper records indicate that more than three hundred plays by nearly a hundred playwrights were produced in Richmond between 1819 and 1838. Among the playwrights most numerous represented were George Colman, the younger, Thomas Morton, and John O'Keefe. The records indicate the production of no less than sixteen plays by Colman, eleven by Morton, and ten by O'Keefe. Shakspeare, with fourteen plays, stands second to Colman; Shakspeare's fourteen plays were acted 106 times and Colman's sixteen 104 times. The most popular plays include *The Day After the Wedding*, *The Poor Soldier*, and *The Spoiled Child*. Twenty-three performances of *The Spoiled Child* are recorded. The only other play to equal this number is *Richard III*.

Among Shakspeare's plays *Hamlet* and *Othello*, with records of fifteen performances each, stand next to *Richard III*. *Macbeth*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Romeo and Juliet* were produced ten times each. Less popular were *Lear*, produced seven times, and *Much Ado About Nothing* and *The Taming of the Shrew*, produced five times each. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was played twice, and *As You Like It*, *Henry IV*, *Julius Caesar*, and *King John* once each. The popularity of these plays in relation to others may be indicated by mentioning that forty-six plays were produced ten times or more each; six of these forty-six were Shakspeare's. It is noticeable that Shakspeare's tragedies were far more popular than his comedies, which were for the

most part crowded off the stage by eighteenth century comedies and contemporary farces. It must be remembered, however, that the number of performances cannot be considered an accurate representation of the audiences' tastes or opinions of the merits of the plays. Certain plays were produced more frequently because they included the favorite rôles of the star actors, and the audiences were attracted perhaps more by the star than by the play. *Richard III*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello* offered favorite starring rôles.

Shakspere's greatest characters were interpreted to the Richmond audience by the greatest stars of the American stage. Lucius Junius Booth made his American début in Richmond on July 6, 1821, as Richard III, a rôle which he repeated many times. Other notable Richards were Finn, Charles Kean, Mrs. Hill, and Miss Clara Fisher. Hamlet, Macbeth, and Othello were all played by Booth, Cooper, Conway, and Vandenhoff. Other Hamlets included Oxley, Wallack, and Mrs. Barnes; other Macbeths included Wallack and George Jones; other Othellos included Oxley and Edwin Forrest. Booth appeared in a wide range of Shaksperean rôles, including, in addition to those mentioned, Iago, Shylock, and Lear. Cooper's other rôles included Petruchio, Mark Anthony, and Benedick. The famous comedian Thomas Hilson played Falstaff and Touchstone; but he also appeared as Shylock, Iago, Falconbridge, and Richard III. Mrs. Gilfert starred with equal ease in comedy and tragedy, playing Beatrice, Constance, Cordelia, Catharine, Desdemona, Elizabeth, Juliet, Lady Macbeth, Portia, and Rosalind.

We may assume that all of Shakspere's plays were altered or adapted for the stage, yet the alterations were mentioned only twice. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was advertised once as "Shakespeare's corrected Comedy,"¹³ but there was nothing to indicate the name of the corrector or the nature of the corrections. *Catharine and Petruchio* was usually advertised as Shakspere's, only one advertisement mentioning that it was "altered from Shakespeare's comedy of *The Taming of the Shrew*."¹⁴ Doubtless the adaptation was by Garrick.

The version of *Richard III* which was so familiar to the

Richmond audience was evidently Cibber's, which held the stage both in England and America during this period and later.⁵ Several casts of characters as advertised in the Richmond newspapers⁶ correspond closely with Cibber's. Further evidence is in a criticism of Booth's *Richard III* in which the critic quotes Cibber's famous "Richard's himself again."⁷

In 1823 a Richmond newspaper copied an article from the London *Courier* of February 11 on the revival of *King Lear*. Nahum Tate's adaptation held the stage well into the nineteenth century, but the writer says that Shakspeare's *Lear* "was tried last night with sufficient success." The critic, in condemning the taste which would prefer Tate's adaptation, says: "We are gratified in announcing this counter revolution in the fates of *Lear*, this change from the heavy phraseology and tardy feeling of the Ancient Laureate, to the deep and rich poetry and passion of the play of Shakspeare."⁸

Tate's *Lear* evidently held the Richmond stage from 1819 to 1838. When a local critic wrote of Booth's *Lear* as "a king finally restored to his throne and its dignities,"⁹ he had witnessed Tate's play and not Shakspeare's acted by Booth. Arante is included in the cast of characters for the performance to which the critic refers.¹⁰ Although four of the advertised casts of *Lear* are brief to the exclusion of all but major characters, twice later¹¹ complete casts included Arante. It seems that for all seven representations of *Lear* the monster was led about the stage with Tate's tent-hook in his nose.

Perhaps the most interesting Shaksperian performance was the "Grand Dramatic Olio, from Shakspeare, in five parts,"¹² in which Frederick Brown for his benefit acted *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Richard III*, and *Coriolanus*—one act from each. This was the only production of *Coriolanus*.

The large body of theatrical criticism preserved in the Richmond newspapers of this period is mostly concerned with the abilities of the actors, yet occasional comments reveal the critics' interpretations and judgments of the plays.

In his criticism of Booth's Richard III, "Virginiensis" proved himself a true Southern Gentleman by declaring that, "the courting scene with *Lady Anne* is absolutely a libel on female character, and as such shocks every delicate mind."¹³ "A Friend of the Drama" wrote of Macbeth that "no character in the whole range of the Drama, except perhaps that of Lear, requires such rare talents. The gradual working up of such a mind as Macbeth's to the unholy purposes of ambition, until he brings himself to the murder of his sovereign, calls forth all the genius of Shakespeare."¹⁴ "Rusticus" considered *Othello* "one of Shakspeare's best" plays, because "none can be more replete with high-toned impassioned feeling—none better calculated to test the skill of an actor, and the judgment of an audience." The rôle of *Othello* he considered "one of the most difficult in the whole range of characters."¹⁵ Daniel Trueheart, editor of the *Richmond Compiler*, expressed a similar opinion in his criticism of *Lear* when he wrote that "the drama of *Lear* is better fitted for the closet than the stage. There is not that scope of high wrought passion about *Lear* (his old age forbids it), which is calculated to give full play to the genius of the actor. *Lear*, for instance, is decidedly inferior to *Richard* or to *Othello*."¹⁶ It is well to remember at this point that Trueheart was criticizing Nahum Tate's version of *King Lear*.

"Philo-Drama" wrote two extended criticisms, the first on *Hamlet*, the second on *Macbeth*. He pointed out two particular weaknesses in the characterization of *Hamlet*. The first is *Hamlet's* renunciation of *Ophelia*, because it "requires of *Hamlet*, under assumed madness, a total and instantaneous eradication of the strongest natural affections." However, "by a little deviation from the ordinary mode of representing the interview between *Hamlet* and *Ophelia*, the whole difficulty is removed." Also, in the interview between *Hamlet* and the Queen "we are accustomed to witness the most unnatural and malignant spirit" when *Hamlet*, "with a temper totally adverse to that which is displayed in the general character, taunts, if not grossly insults the Queen." In the correct interpretation *Hamlet*, "under the impulse of filial attachment, remonstrates with her, firmly and earnestly, but not vindictively."¹⁷

In his criticism of *Macbeth*, "Philo-Drama" writes that although there is "none which furnishes a more ample field for the display of great histrionic powers, . . . it has appeared to be unsuited to both of the leading dramatic schools. Neither the impetuosity of Kean nor the tameness of Kemble is competent to cover the fiend-like ambition, crouching under fear, which is so admirably blended in the character of Macbeth." Macbeth embodies "in the same person, that towering ambition which can brook no repulse, consociate with an appalling [*sic*] natural timidity, struggling for ascendancy. To let either passion 'run riot' would destroy the author's intention." A misconception of the dagger soliloquy is often responsible for the total failure of an actor in this rôle. "If fear assume the ascendancy and become the all-absorbing and appalling feeling, Macbeth, irresolute as he is, must be forever disarmed." The correct interpretation preserves, "as the guiding star, that ambition, which, though it faltered, had never for a moment deviated from its fell purpose." Lady Macbeth is "without exception the most difficult of Shakespeare's female characters . . . While by her energy of purpose and boldness of thought, she leads onward the ambitious but coward mind of her husband, she has not lost those female attributes, tenderness and love, which alone can secure her influence over her pliant tool . . . This compound of moral contradictions, conjugal devotions, and unrelenting cruelty, must be conceived and personated by the successful *artiste*."¹⁸

It is evident that the Shaksperian plays most often acted in Richmond during this period were the same as those most often acted in the other American theatres for which records are available, and the same actors interpreted the same rôles.¹⁹ Adaptations from Shakspeare, even those which substantially altered the plays, were almost without exception advertised as Shakspeare, and apparently the audience and even the critics made no distinction between Shakspeare and Cibber, Garrick, or Tate. Newspaper criticism was concerned more with histrionic than dramatic merit, but occasional articles reveal that Shakspeare's tragedies were admired above all others because they offered the greatest acting rôles.

SUPPLEMENT

Following is a list of Shakspeare's plays produced in the Richmond Theatre between June 11, 1819, and November 14, 1838. Dates of performance are based upon records in contemporary Richmond newspapers. Two dates in parenthesis indicate that the play was produced between those dates. *As You Like It*; 1819, Nov. 8.

Catherine and Petruchio, or The Taming of The Shrew; altered by David Garrick; 1819, July 3; 1821, Oct. 22; 1828, Dec. 26; 1829, April 21; 1837, Oct. 17.

Hamlet; 1819, June 21, Nov. 1; 1820, July 24, Aug. 30; 1822, Nov. 20; 1824, (Nov. 1-Nov. 13); 1828, Dec. 10; 1829, Nov. 14; 1831, Jan. 10; 1837, Jan. 14, Mar. 3, Oct. 27; 1838, Jan. 15, Feb. 19, 24.

Henry IV; 1819, Oct. 13.

Julius Caesar; 1819, July 7.

King John; 1822, July 22.

King Lear; altered by Nahum Tate; 1819, Nov. 26; 1821, July 11; 1822, Nov. 22, Dec. 4; 1828, Dec. 26; 1831, Feb. 4; 1838, Jan. 26.

Macbeth; 1819, June 28, Oct. 25, Dec. 23; 1821, Sept. 12, Oct. 19; 1822, Nov. 30; 1824, (Nov. 1-Nov. 13); 1838, Jan. 13, Feb. 20, 27.

Merchant of Venice, The; 1819, July 31, Dec. 18, 22; 1820, July 7; 1822, June 22, 1828, Feb. 14; 1829, June 3; 1830, Jan. 6; 1831, Jan. 7; 1838, Feb. 23.

Merry Wives of Windsor, The; 1820, Dec. 18; 1822, June 26.

Much Ado About Nothing; 1820, Sept. 18; 1822, July 8; 1829, Nov. 3; 1830, Oct. 6; 1837, Mar. 24.

Othello, 1819, June 23, Oct. 16, Dec. 11; 1821, June 25; 1822, Nov. 18; 1824, (Nov. 1-Nov. 13); 1828, Oct. 18; 1829, Oct. 14; 1830, Oct. 15; 1831, Apr. 5; 1836, Dec. 9; 1837, Mar. 31; 1838, Jan. 6, 12, 27.

Richard III, or The Battle of Bosworth Field; altered by Colley Cibber; 1819, June 12; 1820, Sept. 4, Oct. 28; 1821, July 6, 13, Sept. 10; 1822, Nov. 11, 16, Dec. 7; 1828, (Feb. 1-Feb. 13), Dec. 20; 1829, Nov. 26, Dec. 10; 1830, Oct. 11, 16, Nov. 2; 1831, Jan. 3, 13, 31, Feb. 19, 24; 1832, Dec. 27; 1838, Jan. 23.

Romeo and Juliet; 1819, July 23; 1820, Sept. 27; 1828, Oct. 29; 1829, Jan. 20, Oct. 30; 1837, Mar. 14, Apr. 5, Dec. 29; 1838, Feb. 15, 22.

¹For a more extended introduction see my related article, "American Plays in the Richmond Theatre, 1819-1838," *Studies in Philology* (1940), 37: 100-19.

²See Lester Jesse Cappon, *Virginia Newspapers 1821-1935* (New York, 1936), pp. 164-95.

³*Compiler* (Richmond), December 18, 1820.

⁴*Whig* (Richmond), October 17, 1837.

⁵Alice I. P. Wood, *The Stage History of Shakespeare's King Richard the Third* (New York, 1909), *passim*.

⁶*Compiler*, June 12, 1819, September 4, 1820, October 28, 1820, July 6, 1821, et al.

⁷*Ibid.*, July 16, 1821

⁸*Ibid.*, April 23, 1823.

⁹*Ibid.*, July 13, 1821.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, July 11, 1821.

¹¹*Ibid.*, December 4, 1822, *Whig*, December 26, 1828.

¹²*Compiler*, July 9, 1821.

¹³*Mercantile Advertiser* (Richmond), July 9, 1821.

¹⁴*Compiler*, October 27, 1819

¹⁵*Mercantile Advertiser*, June 27, 1821.

¹⁶*Compiler*, June 13, 1821

¹⁷*Ibid.*, March 10, 1838

¹⁸*Ibid.*, March 13, 1838.

¹⁹See George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927-28), Volumes II-IV, *passim*; Reese D. James, *Old Drury of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932), *passim*.

University of Oklahoma

SOLILOQUY ON HAMLET*

Prince Hamlet was an utter snob,
All human contacts made him skittish;
He couldn't bear the Danish mob,
Of course he couldn't like the British.

He scorned the public's taste in plays
He didn't even like his mother!
He flouted harmless popinjays
And simply loathed his father's brother

He never missed a chance to spurn
Polonius with spiteful mocking,
While Rosencrantz and Guildenstern,—
The way he used those boys was shocking!

He acted like the only one
In all the planets' perihelia;
And telling her to be a nun
Showed scant affection for Ophelia.

What *did* he like? A ghostly shade,
His late lamented father's double,
Which told malicious lies that made
The family a heap of trouble

I doubt if William Shakespeare's heirs
Or Francis Bacon's give a damnlet,
Or any critic greatly cares,—
But that's your "mystery of Hamlet!"

*Taken from *Lyric Laughter*, by Arthur Guiterman, published and copyrighted by E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1939. All rights reserved

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occuring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics

Published in 1940*

Compiled by RALPH P ROSENBERG

*Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the baptismal name. The bibliography covered by this Index was published in the January, 1940, issue of this *Bulletin*. Sh = Shakspeare.

A

Abridgements, 10991
Acting and actors, 10992-10998, 11007,
11105, 11296, 11412, 11450
Adam, R., 11042
Adams, J Q, 11106, 11130, 11379
Adaptations, 11364, 11367, 11510
Aesthetics, 11023
Albrecht, J, 11176
Alciati, A., 11119
Aldridge, I., 10993
Alexander, A G., 11265
Alexander, P., 11028, 11073
Allen, D. C., 11086, 11097, 11225, 11250,
11322
Allen, M S, 11415
Allen, N B, 11385
America, Sh in, 11000-11003, 11236,
11255
Anderson, M L, 11508
Anderson, R L, 11076
Antokolskoi, P, 11369
Antony and Cleopatra, 11273
Arlett, V I, 11166
Armstrong, T P, 11410
Arthur, J, 11016
Astrology, 11004, 11366
Astronomy, 11005
As You Like It, 11016, 11078, 11274-
11277, 11511
Atkinson, B, 11313, 11317, 11367
Auden, W. H., 11094
Austin, W. B., 11151, 11240
Authorship, Sh, 11390, 11404
Autographs, 11006
Azzalino, W., 11232

B

B, A, 11403
Bachofen-Freud, 11338
Bacon, 11008, 11084, 11260, 11341
Bacon-Sh imbroglia, 11007-11018, 111070,
11391
Barn, R., 11440
Barne, R. M., 11377

Baker, H., 11165, 11230, 11405, 11448,
11502, 11507
Baker, H C, 11117
Baker, H K., 11030, 11411
Bald, R C, 11251
Baldwin, C. S., 11140, 11268, 11437,
11473, 11491
Baldwin, T. W., 11408
Ball, R H., 11248
Ballads, broadside, 11117
Barnes, M: 11449
Baroque, 11104
Barrell, C W., 11446
Bartholomaeus, Anglicus, 11274
Bartlett, H C, 11024
Baughan, D. E., 11297, 11474
Beaumont, 11019, 11249
Beckmann, A. T., 11052
Bell, C, 11138
Benjamin, N. 11049
Bennett, R. E., 11132
Bentley, G. E., 11466
Beretz, M., 11361
Bergmann, A., 11180
Bernard, J E, Jr, 11505
Bhattacharyee, M M., 11203, 11298
Bhave, Y. D., 11205
Bibliography, 11020-11024
Bridow, H., 11495
Bill, A H., 11471
Biology, 10007, 10025-11035, 11089,
11181
Boas, G., 11450
Bodleian's First Folio, 11168
Bohet, V, 11069
Bond, R W., 11316
Book titles, 11036-11055
Booth, E, 10998
Boughner, D C, 11199, 11241, 11355
Bowers, F. T., 11101, 11135, 11456-11457
Bradbrooke, W., 11494
Bray, D., 11296
Brennecke, E, Jr, 11276
Breton, N., 11056, 11475
Bridgewater, H, 11013
Broke, A., 11415
Bronowski, J., 11424

Brooke, T., 11272
 Brother Leo, 11460
 Brown, B. D., 11242
 Brown, B. G., 11195
 Brown, I., 11257, 11259, 11262
 Buchanan, G., 11469
 Bullough, G., 11193
 Buning, W. F. W., 11280
 Bunnett, R. J. A., 11013
 Burger, H., 11398
 Burton, 11171, 11260
 Bush, D., 11197

C

Cambillard, 11366
 Camden, C. C., 11453
 Cameron, K. W., 11447
 Campbell, O. J., 11406
 Campion, Thomas, 11057
 Cartier, 11007
 Casson, T. E., 11503
 Catalan, G., 11496
 Cawley, R., 11107
 Cervantes and Sh., 11324
 Chamberlain, F., 11153
 Chambers, D., 11051
 Chambers, R. W., 11392
 Chambrun, C. L. de, 11026
 Chapman, G., 11058-11061, 11104, 11130
 Chapman, J. A., 11433
 Characters, Age of Sh's, 11078, 11087
 Charell, E., 11367
 Charlton, H. B., 11069, 11357
 Chew, S. C., 11079
 Child, H. H., 11044
 Children, Sh. and, 10991, 11344
 Chronology, Sh., 11388, 11390
 Chubb, T. C., 11211
 Claireau, H., 11291
 Clark, D. L., 11206, 11437
 Clark, E. G., 11100
 Clemens, Samuel, 11255
 Closs, A., 11504
 Coffin, M., 11005
 Cole, G. D., and M., 11041
 Cole, J. W., 11386
 Coleman, E. D., 11215
 Coleridge and Sh., 11314
 Colman and Garrick, 11364
 Comedy, 11062-11064, 11069, 11092, 11247, 11411
Comedy of Errors, 11278-11280, 11512
Comical Satyre and Sh's Troilus and Cressida, 11406
 Commentary, 11065-11096, 11062, 11104
 Congleton, J. E., 11442
 Contemporaries, 11080, 11097-11099, 11106
 Contemporary drama, 11100-11108, 11076

Contemporary poetry, 11109-11117
 Contemporary prose, 11116, 11118-11119
 Coon, A. M., 11136
Coriolanus, 11052, 11281-11283, 11435, 11512
 Cornell, K., 10992
 Cosmic identities, Doctrine of, 11086
 Craig, H., 11021, 11285, 11459
 Criminology, 11345-11346, 11373, 11382
 Cuss, M., 11497
 Ciundell, H. W., 11323, 11389-11390
 Cryptography, 11009
 Curtis, G. B., 11189
 Customs, 11120

D

d'Amico, S., 11296
 D'Avenant, William, 11121
 Davies, John, 11122
 Davies, W. R., 10994
 Davis, F. C., 11048
 Davis, R. B., 11098
 Deetjen, W., 11182
 Dekker, Thomas, 11123-11130, 11198
 Dickson, G. B., 11099
 Dictionaries, 11235
 Dodds, M. H., 11087, 11307, 11349
 Donne, John, 11131-11139, 11221
 Dowlin, C. M., 11476
 Diaat, P. F. v., 11333
 Drake-Carnell, F. J., 11120
 Drama, 11076, 11095, 11140-11141
 Drant, Spenser, and Queen Elizabeth, 11478
 Drapei, J. W., 11077, 11274, 11282, 11287, 11293, 11372, 11376, 11384, 11399
 Drayton, Michael, 11142-11146
 Dukes, A., 11412
 Dumbshow, The, 11292
 Dunlap, A. R., 11370
 Dunn, E. C., 11001, 11003
 D'Urfey, Thomas, 11147
 Dutch translation of Sh., 11280

E

Eagle, R. L., 11259, 11388, 11391
 Eccles, M., 11127
 Edgelow, M., 11434
 Editions, Sh., 11416a, 11448-11449, 11510-11512
 Editors, Editing, 11148-11150, 11416a, 11448-11449, 11510-11512
 Education, 11151
 Eicke, W. A., 11210
 Einarsson, S., 11201
 Eliot, T. S., 11133
 Elizabeth, Queen, 10995, 11152-11153, 11240, 11478
 Elizabethan revival, 11261

Elliott, G. R., 11279
 Ellis-Fermor, U 11246
 Emendations, 11312
 Environment, 11154-11158
 Erasmus, 11159-11164
 Eschenburg's translation of Sh, 11183
 Ethics, 11059, 11165
 Evans, M., 11313, 11317, 11319
 Everett, A. L., 11031
 Ewen, C. L., 11455
 Ewing, S. B., Jr., 11171
 Exner, H., 11162

F

Facsimiles, Sh, 11408
 Farjeon, H., 11512
 Faust legend, 11246
 Faustus, Magus, and Marlowe, 11242
 Fearon, G., 11259, 11262
 Feibleman, J., 11064
 Fellowes, E. H., 11057
 Feudal manners in Sh, 11203
 Fictionised, 11166-11167
 Finkel, M., 10993
 Fischer, B., 11045
 Fischer, W., 11231
 Fisher, H. K., 11300
 Fisher, M., 11252
 Fletcher, John, 11019, 11035, 11249
 Folio, Bodleian, 11168
 Ford, F. M., 11096
 Ford, John, 11068, 11169, 11171
 Ford, L., 11047
 Forkey, L. O., 11269
 Fox, A., 11421
 France, Sh in, 11172-11174, 11303, 11337
 Frank, W., 11091
 Franz, W., 11234
 Fieyer, G., 11213
 Friedland, L. S., 11115
 Fripp, E. I., 11025
 'Fustian,' Elizabethan 11100

G

G, J., 11345
 Garnick, David, 11175, 11340, 11364
 Geoghegan, H., 11330
 Germany, Sh in, 11176-11185, 11289,
 11281, 11343, 11397
 Gervinus, Bacon, and S, 11008
 Gielgud, J., 10996
 Gilbert, A. H., 11058
 Gilbert, F., 11209
 Gildemeister, O., 11504
 Gilder, R., 11317
 Gill, W. W., 11335
 Gilpin, E., 11132
 Glendenning, L., 11017

Glunz, H. H., 11308, 11383, 11445
 Goldman, M. S., 11467
 Goll, A., 11345-11346, 11373, 11382
 Goodyear, S., 11036
Gorboduc, 11448-11449
 Gosson, S., 11097, 11237
 Gottfried, R., 11485
 Graham, C. B., 11218
 Grange, J., 11116
 Gray, M. M., 10995
 Greene, Robert, 11186-11192a
 Greg, W. W., 11285
 Greville, F., 11193
 Grillparzer, Sh and, 11207
 Groom, B., 11302
 Guazzo, 11119, 11192, 11508
 Guicciardini, 11209
 Guiney, L. I., 11111, 11217
 Gurland, I., 11334

H

Habgood, F. E. C., 11012
 Hackett, F., 11325
 Hadas, M., 11465
 Haedens, K., 11303
 Hall, J., 11014
 Halstead, W. L., 11123-11125, 11128-
 11129
Hamlet, 11039, 11040, 11042, 11047-
 11048, 11050, 11053, 11284-11315,
 11511-11512
 Hampden, J., 11299
 Hannigan, J. E., 11360
 Hanson, V., 11050
 Harbage, A., 10999
 Hardman, D., 11074
 Harker, F., 11306
 Harrison, G. B., 11029, 11156
 Harrison, T. P., Jr., 11487
 Hastings, W. T., 11103, 11208, 11511
 Hauptman, Sh and, 11179
 Hawaii, Sh and, 11283
 Headley, H., 11261
 Henderson, W. B. D., 11337
Henry IV, 11077-11078, 11316-11324
Henry VIII, 11325
 Henshaw, M., 11022
 Henslowe's diary, 11130
 Herbert, G., 11194-11196
 Heyer, G., 11053
 Heyn, W., 11301
 Heywood, J., 11447
 Heywood, Thomas, 11111, 11126, 11197-
 11198
 Hicks, F. W. P., 11362
 Hill, R. [ed.], 11510
 Hill, R., 11106
 Hollybrand, C., 11151
 Holmes, J., 11419

Hooker, R., 11199
 Howarth, R. G., 11061
 Huck, R., 11289
 Hulbert, V. B., 11480
 Hungary, Sh in, 11200
 Hunter, E. R., 11090
 Hussey, D., 11270
 Hutchinson, F. E., 11194
 Hutchison, P., 11248

I

Ibsen, Sh and, 11288
 Iceland, Sh in, 11201
 India, Sh in, 11202-11205, 11298
 Influence, Sh's, 11206-11207, 11294
 Ireland, Wm. H., 11208
 Italy, Sh in, 11062, 11209-11213, 11270

J

Jackson, D., 11429
 Jackson, W. A., 11115
 Jacobean Age, 11154
 Jacobean playwrights, 11103
 Jaggard, W., 11494
 Japan, Sh in, 11214
 Jeanne d'Arc, 11172
 Jenkins, H., 11271
 John, L. C., 11112
 Jestbooks, 11118
 Jews, 11215-11216, 11354-11361
 Johnson, F. R., 11005
 Jones, H. S. V., 11484
 Jones, O., 11184
 Jonson, Ben, 11076, 11104, 11217-11229
Julius Caesar, 11054, 11326-11332, 11511

K

Kastendieck, M., 11057
 Kean, E., 10997
 Kellett, E. E., 11350
 Kentish-Wright, U., 11475
 Khrennikov, T., 11369
King John, 11043
King Lear, 11333, 11427
 Kittredge, G. L., 11277, 11315, 11332, 11353, 11368, 11402, 11511
 Klein, D., 11326
 Kleinschmidt, O., 11426
 Knappen, M. M., 11458
 Knight, G. W., 11239, 11441
 Knox, R. S., 11092
 Kocher, P. H., 11404
 Krauss, W., 11159
 Krieger, H., 11281
 Kroepelin, H., 11185, 11452
 Kyd, Thomas, 11076, 11104, 11111, 11230-11231, 11311

L

L., G. G., 11481
 L., L., 11295
 Laforgue, J., 11303
 Lalow, R., 11081
 Langdale, A. B., 11035
 Language, 11232-11236, 11335, 11409, 11489, 11500
 Lanyon, C. L., 11263
 Larsen, T., 11253
 Latham, A. M. C., 11454
 Law, R. A., 11192a
 Lawience, W. W., 11304
 Lazenby, C., 11183
 Leaf, M., 11387
 Legouis, E., 11365
 Leishman, J. B., 11393
 Leith, A. A., 11008
 Lemaitre, J., 11015
 Lennep, W. B. V., 11312
 Leo, Brother, 11460
 Levin, H., 11228
 Lewis, B. R., 11025
 Lewis, C. S., 11425
 Leycester, 11153
 Lievsay, J. L., 11119, 11192
Limited Editions Club's Sh, 11149, 11512
 Lind, L. R., 11266
 Littlewood, S. R., 11095
 Loane, G. C., 11060
 Lockridge, R., 11317
 Lodge, Thomas, 11111, 11237
 London, 11238, 11243, 11252
 Long, E. H., 11236
Love's Labour's Lost, 11078, 11340-11341
 Lyceum, End of the, 11309
 Lyly, John, 11239-11241

M

Mabbott, T. O., 11223
Macbeth, 11038, 11044, 11045, 11067, 11342-11353, 11511
 MacCarthy, D., 11309
 Machiavelli, 11209-11213
 MacLeish, A., 11423
 Magus, Marlowe, and Faustus, 11242
 Maur, J., 11208
 Malone, E., 11150
 Mandin, L., 11371
 Mann, W., 11273
 Manuscripts, Sh, 11032
 Marcu, V., 11211
 Marks, S., 11006
 Marlowe, C., 11242-11246
 Marnot, J., 11456
 Marston, John, 11104, 11219, 11247
 Masque, 11102, 11105
 Massinger, Philip, 11019, 11248-11249

Masson, A., 11267
 Mathew, D., 11154
 Matthes, H. C., 11164, 11250
 Maxwell, B., 11019, 11249, 11285
 McAnally, A. M., 11102
 McCain, H. E., 11318
 McCormick, V. T., 11509
 McGinn, D. J., 11294
 McLlwraith, A. K., 11121
 McKerrow, R. B., 11148, 11284, 11329, 11499
 McManaway, J. G., 11312
 McNeal, T. H., 11191
Measure for Measure, 11046, 11512
 Meine, F. J., 11255
 Meissner, P., 11105, 11107
 Melbancke, 11097
 Melsome, W. S., 11011
 Menon, C. N., 11202, 11204
Merchant of Venice, 11036, 11055, 11354-11361
Mercury Sh, The, 11510
 Meres, F., 11250
Merry Wives of Windsor, 11037, 11078, 11362
 Messiaen, P., 11034, 11320, 11374
 Metz, R., 11139
 Michie, S.: 11479
 Middleton, Thomas, 11251-11254
Midsommer Night's Dream, 11363-11368, 11511-11512
 Millican, C. B., 11478, 11486, 11489-11490
 Mills, D. 11157
 Milne, W. S., 11352
 Milton, 11145, 11350
 Mirror concept, 11076
Mirror for Magistrates, The, 11109
 Miscellanea, 11255-11265
 Moddei, M. F., 11216
 Montaigne, M., 11266-11269, 11337
 Moore, J. R., 11413
 Moore, Sir Thomas, 11383
Moore, Sir Thomas, 11388-11392
 Morgan, C., 11344
 Morgan, R. 11314
 Moritzen, J., 11345-11346, 11373, 11382
 Morley Sh and, 11276, 11413
 Morozov, M., 11463
 Mounts, C. E., 11488
 Moura, J., 11172
 Mouthpieces, Sh's, 11094
Much Ado About Nothing, 11369
 Mueller, W., 11141
 Muir, K., 11027
 Mulcaster, Spenser and, 11490
 Murray, J., 11251
 Murry, J. M., 11195
 Music, 11270, 11276, 11278, 11340, 11367, 11369

Myers, H. A., 11427
 Myrick, K. O., 11467
 N
 Nash, C. A., 11160
 Nesbit, E. 10991
 Nethercot, A. H., 11121
 Neumann, J. H., 11226
New Cambridge Sh, The, 11416a
 Nicoll, A., 11105, 11175
 Norman, C., 11243
 Normand, Lord, 11358
 Norway, Sh in, 11288
 Noyes, G. E., 11235

O

O'Connor, W. V., 11063
 Octosyllabic couplet, 11113
 Odell, G. C. D., 11492
 O'Loughlin, S., 11027
 Orennecke, O., 11413
 Osler on Sh, Bacon, and Burton, 11260
Othello, 11067, 11370-11377, 11512
Oxford Sh, 11148, 11499

P

Painter, W., 11197
 Parker, W. R., 11114
 Parrott, T. M., 11285
 Patterns in Sh, 11092
 Paulin, D. M., 11432
 Paulun, D., 11290
 Payne, B. I., 11305, 11451
 Peele, George, 11271-11272
 Perkinson, R. H., 11122, 11336
 Perry, H. T. E., 11062, 11229, 11247
 Pessimism in the Renaissance, 11066
 Petersen, J., 11443, 11501
 Pettie, 11187
 Phelps, W. L., 11089
 Photography, 11401
 Pinto, V. de S., 11316
 Pirkhofer, A. W., 11202
 Plays, 11273-11377, 11380-11392, 11398, 11418
 Plowman, M., 11342
 Pneumatology, 11108, 11233
 Poems, 11378-11379
 Poetics, 11064, 11071, 11095, 11131, 11139, 11250, 11302, 11329, 11419-11444
 Politics, 11435, 11445
 Pollard, A. W., 11024
 Porterfield, A. W., 11262
 Portraits, 11446
 Praz, M., 11219
 Predecessors, 11165, 11447-11449
 Preusler, W., 11179

Price, H. T., 11500
 Producing Sh, 11176, 11283, 11296, 11313,
 11317, 11319, 11356, 11450-11452,
 11493
 Psychology, 11282, 11298, 11307, 11334,
 11338, 11365, 11376, 11399, 11453
 Punctuation poems, 11363
 Purves, J., 11212
 Pyles, T., 11285

Q

Queen Elizabeth, 10995, 11152-11153
 11240, 11478

R

Radlov, S., 11493
 Raleigh, Walter, 11454-11455
 Randolph, Thomas, 11456-11457
 Rathborne, I. E., 11484
 Rattray, R. F., 11195
 Reformation, 11160
 Rathkey, W. A., 11339
 Reichert, W. A., 11179
 Reilly, H., 11039
 Religion, 11458-11460
 Restoration comedy, 11218
 Rice, S., 11204
Richard II, 11142, 11380-11381
Richard III, 11041, 11382
 Ridley, M. R., 11428
 Ringler, W., 11237
 Robbins, R. H., 11363
 Roberts, B. E., 11052
 Robertson, J., 11056
 Rockingham, 11414
 Rokotov, T., 11083
 Rollins, H. E., 11116, 11378
Romeo and Juliet, 11051, 11078, 11384-
 11387
 Rook, W. A., 11362
 Rosenbach, A. S. W., 11002
 Rossiter, A. P., 11329
 Rowe, K. T., 11468, 11472
 Rowse, A. L., 11109
 Rugoff, M. A., 11139
 Russel, R. W., 11477
 Russia, Sh in, 11082, 11461, 11464

S

Sachar, A. L., 11055
 Sachs, W., 11291
 Saleski, R. E., 11233
 Salinger, H., 11207
 Salter, C. H., 11435
 Sanderlin, G., 11394
 Sandys, G., 11098
 Schlegel, Sh and 11183

Schmidt, W., 11069, 11177, 11383, 11409
 Schücking, L. L., 11023, 11104, 11231,
 11293
 Schummer, K., 11178
 Scott, Sh and, 11085
 Sedgwick, R. W., 10992
 Seifert, A., 11043
 Seldes, G., 11367
 Seligo, I., 11010
 Seneca, 11449, 11465, 11476
 Sensabaugh, G. F., 11169-11170
 Shelley, Sh and, 11206
 Shevchenko, T., 10993
 Shirley, Jas., 11466
 Short, R. W., 11220
 Sibley, A. M., 11133
 Sidney, Philip, 11297, 11467-11474
 Siebeck, B., 11471
 Simpson, E., 11221, 11228
 Simpson, P., 11224, 11227
 Sir Thomas Moore, 11383
Sir Thomas Moore, 11388-11392
 Skinner, O., 10998
 Small, S. A., 11321
 Smalley, D., 11059
 Smallwood, O., 11356
 Smith, D. N., 11150
 Smith, E. L., 11054
 Smith, J., 11244
 Smith, J. C., 11085
 Smith, M., 11431, 11436
 Smith, R. M., 11168
 Social themes, 11062, 11247
 Sondheim, M., 11004
 Sonnet(s), 11114, 11393-11397, 11426
 Sonnet sequences, 11112, 11396
 Sources, 11274, 11328, 11415, 11475-
 11476
 Spain, Sh in 11324
 Spanish Renaissance, 11159
 Spencer, B. T., 11027, 11033, 11065
 Spencer, T., 11131, 11417
 Spenser, Edmund, 11115, 11477-11491
 Spiegelberger, W., 11327
 Staedler, E., 11328
 Stage history, 10996, 11002, 11105, 11176,
 11358, 11380, 11492
 Staging, 11105, 11176, 11296, 11398,
 11412, 11450, 11452, 11493
 Stanley, T., 11466
 Starnes, D. T., 11407
 St. Clair, F. Y., 11144
 Stein, E., 11175
 Stevenson, Sh and, 11264
 Steward, D. H., 11438
 Stoll, E. E., 11067, 11068, 11080, 11275,
 11311, 11359
 Stone, G. W., Jr., 11340, 11364
 Stonley, K., 11447
 Stopes, M. C., 14444

Strarford-on-Avon, 11262, 11494-11495

Stroedl, W., 11176

Stuart, Mary, 11496-11497

Sullivan, F., 11254

Supernatural, 11108, 11233

Swift, Sh and, 11088

Swinburne on Thomas Middleton, 11253

T

Taming of the Shrew, 11398-11399

Tannenbaum, S. A., 11020, 11032, 11126,
11190, 11198, 11286, 11310, 11351,
11375, 11416a, 11506

Teaching Sh, 11265, 11498

Tempest, The, 11049, 11087, 11400-11402,
11511

Textual, 11499-11501

Thaler, A., 11214

Thiel, R., 11504

Thomas, 11238

Thompson, E. N. S., 11113, 11196

Thomson, W., 11393

Thornley, 11238

Thorson, P., 11348

Tieck, Sh and, 11343

Tillotson, K.: 11027, 11112, 11142-11143,
11146, 11396

Tillyard, E. M. W., 11292, 11425

Timon of Athens, 11403-11404

Tinker, E. L., 11149

Titus Andronicus, 11405

Tolstoi, Sh and, 11464

Tottel's *Miscellany*, 11114

Tragedy, 11063, 11141, 11502-11503,
11405

Trahard, P., 11420

Translations, 11504, 11183-11184, 11280,
11343, 11397, 11504

Traub, W., 11273

Traversi, D. A., 11072, 11395

Troilus and Cressida, 11406-11409

Trout, A. L., 11347

Turel, A., 11338, 11464

Turgenev, Sh and, 11082

Twain, Mark, 11255

Twelfth Night, 11276, 11410-11414

Two Gentlemen of Verona, 11415-11416a

Two Noble Kinsmen, 11417

Typography, Elizabethan, 11189

U

Ustick, W. L., 11147

Utterback, E.: 1, 11188

V

Van der Noot, J., 11115

Vandiver, E. P., Jr., 11264

Van Doren, M., 11075, 11093, 11094,
11131

Vaudoyer, J. L., 11173

Verdi, Sh and, 11270

Verse, 11113, 11443, 11505-11507

Vincent, C. J., 11186-11187

Vincent, H. P., 11222

Vincent, R., 11038

Voigt, F. A., 11179

W

Wachter, E., 11018

Waldorf, W.: 11317

Walker, A.: 11025-11026, 11107, 11294

Walker, N. W. G., 11400

Walter, J. H., 11470

Walters, P., 11014

Washburn, O. R., 11040

Wasserman, E. R., 11261

Watkins, W. B., 11088

Watson, S.: R, 11145

Watts, R., Jr., 11317

Webster, John, 11104, 11128, 11508

Weigelin, E., 11301

Weingarten, S., 11498

Weinheber, J., 11430

Welles, O., 11510

Wells, H. W., 11103

Welply, H., 11414

Weninger, L. F., 11331

West, R. H., 11108

Westfall, A. V. R., 11000

Whicher, G. F., 11003

Whipple, S. B., 11317

White, C.: 11418

White, W., 11260

Whitney, E. A., 11163

Wieland, Sh and, 11183

Wilkins, G., 11099

Wilkanson, B., 11381
 Williams, A. L., 11066
 Williams, F. B., Jr., 11155
 Williamson, G., 11134
 Wilson, E. C., 11152
 Wilson, F. P., 11118
 Wilson, J. D., 11158, 11380
 Winston, R., 11211
 Winter, J. W., 11343
Winter's Tale, The, 11087, 11418
 Wolff, G., 11397
 Wollenberg, R., 11181
 Wolthus, G. W., 11245
 Women, 10994, 11509

Wood, F. T., 11175
 Works, 11510-11512
 Wright, L. H., 11466
 Wriothesley, Sh and, 11393
 Wyatt, E. R., 11278
 Wylie, I. A. R., 11167
 Wyneken, H., 11324

Y

Yates, H. E., 11037
 Yolland, A., 11200

Z

Zucker, A. E., 11288

Brooklyn & Hunter Colleges
(Ext. Div.)

ASCHAM'S *SCHOLEMASTER* AND SPENSER'S FEBRUARY ECLOGUE

By SIDNEY ROSENZWEIG

DR. P. W. LONG offered a homily of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, as the source of the fable of the Oak and the Briar in Spenser's February Eclogue.¹ He maintained that the homily provided the poet with the "germ of the fable." This proposed source, however, reveals no verbal parallel to the Eclogue beyond the mention of the briar. In his masterly study of Spenser's fables, Dr. L. S. Friedland pointed out² many analogues to this tale in folk-lore and in Aesop, Chaucer, Geoffrey and Whitney, among others.³ But none of these, Dr. Friedland demonstrated, is the source of Spenser's poem, which reverses the more usual story of the proud Oak and the humble Reed. "By a species of inversion Spenser imparts an entirely new form to the ancient and familiar fable,"⁴ and he did not find "a single instance of a similar reversal of rôles: the Oak abashed and humble, the Briar captious and disdainful," before Spenser's handling of the theme.⁵ I wish, therefore, to call attention to the striking resemblance between the February Eclogue and a section of Ascham's *Scholemaster*.⁶

The poet's knowledge of Ascham's book at the time of publication of *The Shepheardes Calendar* is confirmed by the Harvey-Spenser letters,⁷ and Ascham's experiments with classical meters, though criticized by Harvey and Spenser, may well have been a factor in their own labors. Ascham's work had gone through several editions, one published in 1579.

In the course of his discussion of imitation, Ascham is led into some lively reminiscences of the progress of learning at Cambridge.⁸ He first takes occasion to defend vigorously Nicholas Metcalfe, master of St. John's College, who, though a Catholic, had left the university far richer in money and scholarship than it had ever been. But the ascension of Mary and the restoration of Catholicism brought a severe alteration in the state of learning. Ascham's description of the effects of Catholic rule contains one

parallel to Spenser's fable.⁸ Order and sound education were restored to the university by Elizabeth, and Ascham ends the digression with the prediction that a finer crop of scholars will spring up under the guidance of the new Chancellor of Cambridge, Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burghley. Another striking similarity to the tale appears here.⁹

I have arranged the principal evidence in parallel columns, italicizing similar and significant words. The first section quoted from the Eclogue is the young Briar's complaint to the Husbandman against the aged Oak. The second group of quotations describes the Husbandman's felling of the Oak and the subsequent destruction of the unprotected Briar.

I

The February Eclogue, ll. 163-85.

Ah my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all,
Thou placer of *plants* both humble and tall,
Was I not planted of thine own hand,
To be the primrose of *all thy land*,
With flowring blossomes, to furnish the prime,
And scarlot berries in sommer time?
How falls it then, that this faded Oake,
Whose bodie is seere, whose braunches broke,
Whose naked Armes stretch vnto the fyre.
Vnto such tyrannie doth aspire.
*Hinder*ing with his *shade* my louely light,
And robbing me of the swete sonnes sight?
So beate his old boughes my tender side,
That oft the bloud springeth from woundes wyde:
Vntimely my flowres forced to fall,
That bene *the honor* of your Coronall.

I

The Scholemaster, pp. 165-66

Since which tyme the *yong spring* hath shot up so faire, as now there be in Cambrige againe many goodly plantes (as did well appeare at the Queenes Majesties late being there) which are like to grow *mightie great timber*, to the honor of learning and great good of their contrie, if they may stand their tyme, as he best plantes there were wont to do: and if som *old dotterell trees* with standing over nie them and *dropping vpon them* do not either *hinder*, or crooke their growing, wherein my feare is the less, seeing so worthie a Justice . . . hath the present *oversight of that whole chace*, who was himselfe somtym, in the fairest spring that ever was there of learning, one of the forwardest *yong plantes* in all that worthy College of S. Johnes: who now by grace is growne to soch greatnesse, as in the temperate and quiet *shade* of his wisdome . . .

Compare also the description (p 163) of the trees that "were cast

And oft he lets his cancker wormes *into the fire."*
light
Vpon my braunches, to worke me
 more spight:
 And oft his hoarie locks downe
 doth *cast*,
 Where with my fresh flowretts
 bene defast
 For this, and many more such out-
 rage,
 Crauing your goodlihead to aswage
 The ranckorous rigour *of his might*

To the above may be added E. K.'s gloss on l. 146. The poet writes that the Husbandman came to survey his land and his "trees of state." E. K. explains this phrase as "taller trees fitte for *timber* wood." Note, moreover, that Ascham contrasts the young trees with the old. In the poem, of course, the Briar represents youth and the Oak age.

II

The February Eclogue.

Ll. 201-02.
 But *to the roote* bent his sturdy
 stroke,
 And made many wounds in the
 wast Oake.

Ll. 217-19
 In fine the steele had *pierced* his
 pith,
 Tho *downe to he earth* he fell
 forthwith:
 His wonderous weight made *the*
grounde to quake.

Ll. 222 ff.
 Now stands the Brere like a Lord
 alone,
 Puffed vp with pryde and vaine
 pleasaunce:
 But all this glee had no contin-
 uance.
 For eftsones Winter gan to ap-
 proche,
 The blustering Boreas did en-
 croache
 And beat evpon the solitaire

II

The Scholemaster, p. 163.

. . . not onely the two faire groves
 of learning in England were eyther
cut up by the roote, or troden
downe to the ground and whole-
 lie went to wracke, but the yong
 spring there, and everie where
 else, was *pitifullie nipt* and *over-*
troden by very beastes, and also the
 fairest *standers* of all were rooted
 up

Brere . . .
 For naked left and disconsolate,
 The byting frost *npt* his stalke
 dead,
 The watrie wette weighed downe
 his head,
 And heaped snowe burdned him so
 sore,
 That nowe vpright he can *stand*
 no more:
 And being downe, is *trodde* in the
 durt
 Of cattell, and brouzed, and *soely*
 hurt.

These sentences of Ascham contain more than the ungerminated seed; though Ascham does not name his trees, his sentences embody the almost fully developed form of the fable as it appears in Spenser. And he anticipates Spenser's inversion of the roles of the old and young tree, which was the poet's most notable departure from the traditional story.

Furthermore, the verbal reminiscences are numerous. We must make allowances for the fact that if two authors are writing on the same subject, certain words will inevitably be the same, no matter how independent they are of each other. Such words as "tree" and "plant" rise naturally out of the context and by themselves prove nothing. But the accumulation of echoes that are not necessarily due to the nature of the themes is impressive. There are more scattered through the poem. Spenser's introduction of the Queen into the tale (l. 132) may have been suggested by Ascham's parenthetical mention of "the Queenes Majesties late being there" (p. 165). More important are the characterization and description of the two trees. The young tree is

a bragging brere
 Which proudly thrust into Thelement,
 And seemed to threat the Firmament. (ll. 115-17)

This has the ring of Ascham's praise of Cecil turned to the poet's own uses: "One of the forwardest yong plantes . . . who now by grace is growne to soch greatnesse" (p. 165). And it may or not be a matter of import that in *The Ruines*

of *Time* (ll. 447 ff.) Cecil is likened to an aged tree that chokes off all the growth about it. There may be another echo of Ascham in the pastoral scene that takes place about the Briar:

And thereto aye wonned to repayre
The shepheards daughters, to gather flowres. (ll. 118-19)

E. K.'s gloss on "wonned" reads "to *haunt* or frequent;" Ascham's typically Elizabethan harangue against the Catholics carries the same tone of moral self-righteousness: "honest pastimes joyned with labor left of in the fieldes: unthrifty and idle games *haunted* corners, and occupied the nightes" (p. 165).

We are on safer ground in tracing the portrayal of the Oak to Ascham. Scholars have generally limited the discussion of the Oak's Catholicism to ll. 207-13 of the poem, overlooking a barbed allusion at the beginning of the tale. Thus it is commonly assumed that the fable is disjointed by this awkward obtrusion upon the development of the story. But in the first description of the Oak the metaphor "his toppe" was bald" (l. 113), which stands out against the other features like an exaggerated nose in a Nazi cartoon, may be a reference to priestly tonsure. The image seems to recall Ascham's sketch of the "hedge prieste" with "hys crowne shorne faire and roundlie" (pp. 163, 164). The Briar first chides the Oak with being useless: "Nor the *fruit*, nor for *shadowe* serves thy stocke" (l. 128). He complains later to the Husbandman that the Oake's "*Shade*" (l. 173) robs him of the sunlight. Taken together (and they are a variation of one theme), these lines match Ascham's "and what was the *frute* of this seade?" (p. 164), and "quiet shade" (p. 166). E. K. is too Protean to be summoned as an absolutely reliable witness, but he does help to round out the deposition. The Oak, the poet says, "little him answered" (actually he says nothing), for he was "with shame and greefe *adawed*" (l. 141). E. K. explains "adawed" to mean "daunted and *confounded*." Compare Ascham's testimony regarding the Catholic administration of Cambridge: "the choice of good authors of malice *confounded*" (p. 164). While Ascham was no less anti-papist than Spenser, he, nevertheless, reverences the memory of

Metcalfe, who had been driven from the university because of his opposition to royal supremacy in religion. There would be more than a hint here for the poet's association of Catholicism with the cause of the Oak's downfall. At the same time, Ascham's generous treatment of Metcalfe might conceivably have given Spenser another example for imitation. This view is buttressed by the single favorable epithet applied to the Oak; at the opening the poet writes of the tree as "a *goodly* Oake" (l. 103), later as "the *good* Oake (l. 126). The following statistics will help to prove the point. In the seven and a half pages of Ascham's digression "good" or "goodness" appears twenty-five times; in six of these instances the words are applied to Metcalfe, counting as one the expressive pleonasm "this good mans goodnes." Moreover, in connection with Metcalfe the phrase "good *olde*" occurs once (p. 160). But the clinching bit of evidence is that Ascham uses the same adjective as Spenser, and in the same context, when writing of "the *goodly* plantes . . . which are like to grow to mightie timber" (p. 165). The imagination of the poet seems to have blended Ascham's allusions to Metcalfe, old age, and Catholicism with the fable of the trees.

It is not certain whether this suggested source will throw new light on the long-disputed problem of the allegory.¹¹ Metcalfe, having died in 1539, comes much too early to be the subject of Spenser's poem in 1579 or thereabout. But the Harvey-Spenser correspondence shows that Harvey kept his young friend informed of affairs at Cambridge.¹² It is a reasonable assumption that Spenser, three years after his departure from Cambridge, was still sufficiently interested in his *alma mater* to memorialize an academic incident or figure. Certainly the November Eclogue reveals the poet's opinion of the interdependence of poetry and learning,¹³ *Mother Hubbard's Tale* his solicitude for the advancement of education,¹⁴ and *The Faerie Queene* his continued interest in the "learned impes" of the universities.¹⁵ No name suggests itself at present, but a search through the records of Cambridge may turn up a person of the poet's generation who met with a situation analogous to that of Metcalfe.¹⁶

However that may be, the evidence seems to indicate that

Spenser knew this famous passage of Ascham at least as well as Tom Nashe, who, in his preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, borrowed liberally from it. Spenser clarified, altered, and added many details. He delineated the character of the trees, conceiving the "yong Spring" in a very different light from Ascham, and arranged the plot in clearer outline. In fact, he made of it one of the most skilfully etched short tales of the period.¹⁷

61 Trowbridge Street
Cambridge, Mass.

¹PMLA, XXXI (1916), 727-28.

²SAB, XII (1937), 97-108. One need not accept Mr. Friedland's interpretation of this fable to appreciate the freshness with which he marshals his abundant materials. In agreement with W. L. Renwick, Mr. Friedland reads the disputed reference to Catholicism (ll. 207-13 of the Eclogue) as an allusion to survivals of tree-worship.

³P. 98.

⁴P. 101.

⁵The *Scholemaster*, ed. Mayor (London, 1863), pp. 160-66.

⁶Poetical Works, ed. Smith and Selincourt (London, 1926), pp. 623, 630, 635, 640.

⁷Ascham's reminiscences became commonplaces among university men or writers on the universities. This passage of his book was echoed by Thomas Wilson, Harvey, Mulcaster, and (scornfully) by Bacon; Nashe's address "to the Gentlemen students of both Universities," prefixed to Greene's *Menaphon*, is perhaps the most widely known.

⁸*Scholemaster*, pp. 163-64.

⁹Pp. 165-66.

¹⁰"Priestes" actually appears in the poem, l. 209; to this may be appended the likeness between Spenser's "foolerie" (l. 211) and Ascham's "trifles" (p. 165), both referring to Catholicism.

¹¹W. L. Renwick, *The Shepherd's Calendar* (London, 1930), p. 182, denies there is any problem.

¹²Poetical Works, pp. 620-23.

¹³ll. 29-30, Cf. M. H. T., II, 759 ff.

¹⁴ll. 379, 717, and 829 ff.

¹⁵IV., xi, 26, 34. For more of Spenser's statements on education and learning, see *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. Renwick (London, 1934), pp. 201-02; F. Q. II, iii, 40, II, ix, 48, 53, IV, ii, 1, 2; VI, Proem, 2.

¹⁶The ubiquitous Burghley conveniently intrudes upon the scene in the capacity of Chancellor of Cambridge University. Furthermore, in *The Ruines of Time* (ll. 447 ff.) Spenser, employing again the arboreal imagery of the February Eclogue, attacks Burghley as an enemy of learning (l. 440) and poetry. But until some one is found to qualify for the rôle of the goodly Oak, it would be most judicious to hold in abeyance Burghley's candidacy for the rôle of the Briar. J. J. Higginson, *Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar in Relation to Contemporary Affairs* (Columbia University Press, 1912), pp. 51 ff., proposes Burghley as the Briar, but in connection with court intrigue.

¹⁷Spenser's version of the tale may have some bearing on one of Shakspeare's references to the story. To Mr. Friedland's list of Shakspeare's allusions to the fable should be appended 3 *Henry VI*, V, ii, 11-15. Mr. Friedland states that "whereas Whitney's emblems may have some relation to the one by Spenser, the other contemporary references to the fable of the Tree and the Reed are as a rule simple allusions to a traditional and proverbial tale" (*Shake. Assoc. Bulletin*, p. 100). This does not apply to the fable as used by Shakspeare in Warwick's speech. In common with Spenser, Shakspeare depicts the tree (a cedar) as kind and protective, and there are one or two verbal likenesses, which, however, are not decisive.

JAMES FENIMORE COOPER AND SHAKSPERE*

By EDWARD P. VANDIVER, JR.

I

IN Cooper's novels more than eleven hundred lines are quoted from Shakspeare. What is even more remarkable is that these lines are drawn from thirty-six plays and from *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. The only play not quoted is *Titus Andronicus*; however, Cooper does refer to this play in his letters in such a way as to indicate that he was familiar with it.¹ Strangely enough, the sonnets are apparently not quoted at all. Some of these lines are quoted within the chapters. Most of them, however—about 1,089—appear in 394 places as chapter headings or as mottoes for an entire book or for the introduction to a book.²

One might hastily assume that Cooper merely used a book of quotations to secure a suitable Shaksperian line or group of lines for his various chapter headings and that he had only a superficial knowledge of these works. A study of the quotations, however, impresses one with the fact that many of these lines are not well known and would not be found in a book of quotations. For example, Cooper draws upon *2 Henry VI*—one of Shakspeare's poorest and least read plays—seventeen times, quoting forty different lines. It seems improbable that he would have used these particular quotations unless he knew this play well, since it would have been much easier to find suitable lines from the well-known plays.

The quotations from *2 Henry VI* and the chapters of the novels in which they appear, follow:

Why droops my lord, like over-ripen'd corn,
Hanging the head at Ceres' plenteous load?
I, ii 1f., in *The Redskins*, II)

Pray God the Duke of York excuse himself!
(I, iii, 181, in *The Prairie*, XII)

*The purpose of this study is to show Cooper's knowledge of Shakspeare, his opinion of Shakspeare, his use of many Shaksperian quotations and references in his novels, and his especial indebtedness to *The Tempest* and *The Water-Witch*.

The witch in Smithfield shall be burn'd to ashes,
And you three shall be strangled on the gallows.
(II, iii, 7-8, in *The Prairie*, XXVIII)

Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all.
(III, iii, 31, in *Heidenmauer*, XXVIII)

Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all,
Close up his eyes and draw the curtains close,
And let us all to meditation.
(III, iii, 31-33, in *Lionel Lincoln*, XXIII)

1 Gent. What is my ransom, Master? Let me know.
Mast. A thousand crowns, or else lay down your head.
Mate. And so much shall you give or off goes yours,
(IV, i, 15-17, in *Miles Wallingford*, XIV)

And as for these whose ransoms we have set,
It is our pleasure one of them depart.
Therefore come you with us, and let him go.
(IV, i, 139-141, in *Miles Wallingford*, XV)

Come and get thee a sword, though made of a lath.
They have been up these two days.
(IV, ii, 1-3, in *The Red Rover*, XX)

I tell thee, Jack Cade, the clothier means to dress the common-
wealth and turn it and put a new nap upon it.
(IV, ii, 5-7, in *The Redskins*, XV)

And yet it is said, "Labour in thy vocation"; which is as much to
say as "Let the magistrates be labouring men"; and therefore should
we be magistrates.
(IV, ii, 17-20, in *The Redskins*, XI)

There shall be in England seven half-penny loaves sold for a
penny, the three hoop'd pot shall have ten hoops, and I will make
it felony to drink small beer. All the realm shall be in common,
and in Cheapside shall my palfrey go to grass.
(IV, ii, 70-75, in *The Redskins*, XII, and in
Home as Found, XV)

Up Fish Street! Down Saint Magnus Corner! Kill and knock
down! Throw them into Thames! What noise is this I hear? Dare
any be so bold to sound retreat or parley when I command them
kill?

(IV, viii, 1-5, in *Lionel Lincoln*, XXVI)

We'll follow Cade! we'll follow Cade!
(IV, viii, 35, in *The Bravo*, XXI, and in
Home as Found, XIV)

A Clifford! a Clifford! We'll follow the King and Clifford.
(IV, viii, 55, in *The Bravo*, XXII)

Whom have we here? Buckingham, to disturb me?
The King hath sent him sure. I must dissemble.

(V, i, 12-13, in *Miles Wallingford*, XIII)

Cooper could hardly have been able to find fifteen passages in *2 Henry VI* as appropriate captions applying to the events in the various chapters they preface if he had not known the play well; and the same statement can probably be applied to his knowledge of most of, if not all of, the other plays. Indeed, it might be interesting for the Shakspeare student to see how many of the following lines—used by Cooper as chapter headings—he can assign to the play in which each occurs or try to find them in a book of familiar quotations:

Thy reason, dear venom, thy reason ³

Dally not with the gods, but get thee gone ⁴

Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits.⁵

Mars dote on you for his novices ⁶

Aye, marry, now unmuzzle your wisdom ⁷

My visor is Philemon's roof, within the house is Jove.⁸

It is raised he hath a mass of treasure ⁹

The play from which Cooper chiefly quotes is *The Merchant of Venice*; then come *The Tempest*, *Hamlet*, and *Macbeth*. The trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice* he draws upon twelve times. The opening pages of *The Tempest* he also quotes from quite frequently, especially in his sea stories. The brief scene in *Macbeth* in which the hero first sees the Weird Sisters (I, iii) furnishes eight quotations; the charming pastoral scene in *The Winter's Tale* (IV, iv), seven.

In *The Prairie* Cooper begins thirty-three of the thirty-four chapters with Shaksperian lines and uses another quotation on the title-page. The only thing lacking for a perfect count is the heading for chapter twenty-two. Likewise in *The Red Rover* thirty-one of the thirty-two chapters begin with Shakspeare; only chapter six fails us. In *The Water-Witch* Shakspeare claims thirty-two of the thirty-four chapters.

It is evident that Cooper probably quotes more widely and more often from Shakspeare for chapter mottoes than does any other novelist. Scott, for instance, who was steeped in Shakspeare, quotes slightly more than six hundred lines for chapter and book mottoes, whereas Cooper quotes almost eleven hundred lines. Both writers quote from thirty-six different plays; but Cooper, unlike Scott, also quotes from *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*.

Cooper does not always limit himself to literal quotations. Sometimes he essays a pun in the best Shaksperian or Elizabethan manner: for instance, when he writes "native and to the manor born."¹⁰ In addition to quoting, Cooper is also fond of referring to Shaksperian characters to make his statements more vivid. He mentions, among others, the Dromios,¹¹ Portia and her caskets,¹² Dogberry,¹³ Trinculo, and Stephano.¹⁴

One of the most interesting statements about Shakspeare is in *Jack Tier*, where Cooper, before quoting from *Measure for Measure*, places Shakspeare above all other writers of secular literature with the exception of Homer and Dante:

"The great poet of our language, and the greatest that ever lived, perhaps, short of the inspired writers of the Old Testament, and old Homer and Dante, has well reminded us that the "little beetle," in yielding its breath, can "feel a pang as great as when a giant dies"¹⁵

II

The thirty-two chapter headings in *The Water-Witch* are only part of the interesting Shaksperian elements in the book. In the "Preface" Cooper, having commented on the fact that patroons and estates have practically ceased to exist, follows the statement with one of his favorite quotations from *2 Henry VI*:

All the realm shall be in common, and in Cheapside shall my palfrey go to grass¹⁶

In the opening chapter there is a reference to "the lean and

slipped pantaloons."¹⁷ Especially interesting, in the same chapter, are the words of Lord Cornbury, relative of and former Governor for Queen Anne, who is now imprisoned for debt:

This is an ill-judged step, Alderman Van Beverout, that lets a gentleman out by night, like the ghost in *Hamlet*, to flee into the narrow house with the crowing of the cock. The ear of my royal cousin hath been poisoned, worse than was the ear of 'murdered Denmark', or the partisans of this Mister Hunter would have little cause to triumph.¹⁸

The ex-Governor, though financially embarrassed, is rich in his knowledge of *Hamlet*, and shortly before the end of this interview, says to Van Beverout:

Plutus preserve thee, sir—but have a care; though I scent the morning air, and must return, it is not forbid to tell the secrets of my prison-house.¹⁹

The audacious seaman, Master Thomas Tiller, reminds one of the boatswain of *The Tempest*. Cooper draws upon lines from the opening scene in *The Tempest* to describe him in the heading for chapter three. Even more Shaksperian is the device of having one of the two important women characters—Eudora—disguised as a handsome young man, whose real identity is not revealed until the last chapter. This situation Cooper uses in two other novels, *The Pilot* and *Jack Tier*. Cooper was also influenced by his knowledge of Ariel in depicting the child Zephyr.

In the "Preface" Cooper refers to *The Water-Witch* as "probably the most imaginative book ever written by the author."²⁰ Especially is there the suggestion of the supernatural in the rapid movements of the ship, "The Water-Witch", and in the almost uncanny ability of the master and the crew to escape injury and capture. When visitors come to the ship, they find an image of the sea-green lady, whom the crew regards as an oracle and protector. In the hands of the sea-green lady is an oracular book in which the answers to one's questions are to be found. The answers consist of various lines from *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth*, *The Tempest* and *Measure for Measure*.²¹

Upon this ship is the ten-year-old boy, Zephyr, whose

form and features are "delicate" and whose attire is "whimsical."²² After asking the sea-green lady when he may have freedom to go ashore (for he has never been), he is answered with the words of Ariel:

I pray thee
Remember, I have done thee worthy service;
Told thee no lies, made no mistakings, served
Without or grudge or grumblings.²³

Zephyr thinks that this answer is made to mock him for it was "very like, though more prettily worded than what I had said myself."²⁴ The second answer comes from a speech of Prospero to Ariel:

Thou think'st
It much to tread the ooze of the salt deep,
And run upon the sharp wind of the north.²⁵

It is evident that Zephyr is delicate and unusual in appearance, that he serves a mistress who is thought to have supernatural power, that he wished freedom (to go on shore for a visit), that his request is like Ariel's to Prospero in thought, that the second answer he receives is taken from Prospero's response to Ariel. In addition to these five similarities between Zephyr and Ariel and their respective situations, we find a sixth in the words of "Master Seadrift" to the boy, who is addressed—as Ariel is addressed by Prospero—as "my tricky spirit."²⁶

"Master Seadrift" not only quotes from *The Tempest* but during the same conversation shows his knowledge of *Henry IV* and Falstaff:

... it becomes a commissioned servant of the crown to use freedom with one who, like the lawless companion of the princely Hal, is but too apt to "rob me the King's Exchequer."²⁷

Before the visitors leave, they ask the sea-green lady three questions and receive three answers, each taken from *Measure for Measure*.²⁸ At this time Master Tiller pays a tribute to Shakspeare: "Our mistress deals chiefly in verse from the old writer whose thoughts are almost as common to us all as to human nature." One is tempted to feel that Cooper is here speaking his own thoughts and asserting his own deep knowledge of Shakspeare. And a little later Cooper, quoting the last answer of the sea-green lady,

"Proclaim it, Provost, round about the city," remarks that it comes from the "well-known comedy of *Measure for Measure*."²⁹

In this novel is Cooper's interesting comment on the practice of placing Shaksperian quotations at the beginning of his chapters:

The words of the immortal poet, with which in deference to an ancient usage in the literature of the language, we have prefaced the incidents to be related in this chapter . . .³⁰

One is also reminded of the weird music of Ariel, in *The Tempest*, when one reads about the music on board the mysterious "Water-Witch"—for example, the following passage:

After a short and rapid symphony, a wind-instrument took up a wild strain, while a human voice was again heard chanting to the music words, which were so much involved in the composition of the air, as to render it impossible to trace more than that their burden was a sort of mysterious incantation to some ocean deity.³¹

Thus what is "probably the most imaginative book" written by Cooper is full of Shaksperian echoes. It contains scattered widely, more than a hundred lines taken from eighteen Shaksperian plays. It contains an interesting reference to the practice of beginning chapters with Shaksperian quotations. It has a reference to the popularity of *Measure for Measure* and to the greatness of Shakspeare. It has a charming young lady who is disguised as a young man. It especially reminds one of *The Tempest*: Master Tiller recalls the impudent boatswain; Zephyr, Ariel; and the sea-green lady and "Master Seadrift", Prospero. The air of mystery and weirdness, including the music, on board the "Water-Witch" suggests the supernatural atmosphere and music of *The Tempest*. In at least seven different places in this book direct quotations from *The Tempest* occur, totalling about seventeen lines. It seems indisputable that Cooper's imagination in the process of creating the story and the characters of *The Water-Witch*, turned again and again to Shakspeare and particularly to *The Tempest*. In fact, this play must have been almost constantly in Cooper's mind; and it may be that this fact accounts for his error in ascribing the lines at the beginning of chapter seventeen.

Like Arion on the dolphin's back,
I saw him hold acquaintance with the waves
So long as I could see—

to *The Tempest* instead of to *Twelfth Night*. At any rate, for this quotation and a great deal else that Cooper put into this book and his other novels he was indebted to Shakspeare.

Mary Baldwin College,
Staunton, Virginia.

¹*The Correspondence of James Fenimore Cooper*, ed. by his grandson, James Fenimore Cooper (New Haven, 1922), I, 227.

²For aid in collecting and checking these quotations I am indebted to my students: Elizabeth Anderson, Betty Boyd, Margaret Browning, Mary Dudley, Maxine Dunlap, Nancy Eskridge, Virginia Hayes, Elaine Kibler, Louise Kirtz, Frances Rue, Almeyda Spratley, Mary Van Atta, Anne Woodward.

³*Heidenmauer*, XVIII.

⁴*The Prairie*, XXI.

⁵*Afloat and Ashore*, title page.

⁶*The Red Rover*, I.

⁷*The Headsmen*, XVII.

⁸*The Prairie*, XVIII.

⁹*The Pioneers*, XXIX.

¹⁰*Afloat and Ashore* (New York. D. Appleton and Co., 1883), p. 47.

¹¹*Homeward Bound*, p. 89.

¹²*Wyandotté*, p. 407.

¹³*Satanstoe*, p. 207.

¹⁴*Home as Found*, p. 290.

¹⁵*Jack Tier*, p. 333.

¹⁶IV, II, 74f.

¹⁷*The Water-Witch*, p. 10

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. vi.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 170, 171, 178, 202-204.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 175f.

²³*The Tempest*, I, ii, 246-249.

²⁴*The Water-Witch*, p. 178.

²⁵*The Tempest*, I, ii, 252-254.

²⁶*The Water-Witch*, p. 186, *The Tempest*, V, i, 226

²⁷*The Water-Witch*, p. 186.

²⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 202-204.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 204.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 330.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 192.

TENNYSON'S EARLIEST SHAKSPERE

PARALLELS

By E. A. MOONEY, JR.

THAT Alfred Tennyson read in his childhood the plays of Shakspeare is evident from the statements in the *Memoir* by his son.¹ That Tennyson had studied some of the plays thoroughly by his fifteenth year is evident from the Shaksperian echoes in *The Devil and the Lady*, an uncompleted play which he composed at the age of fourteen.² Many of the reviewers of *The Devil and the Lady* have referred to the Shaksperian elements in the piece,³ though no one, except Adolf Futing, in his *Tennyson's Jugenddrama*,⁴ has attempted to point out specific parallels.

In this early piece the youthful Tennyson leaned most heavily upon *The Tempest*. Although the "Lady" of Tennyson's title is quite unlike Miranda in character, her situation is analagous to that of Shakspeare's heroine.⁵ Amoret is guarded from half a dozen would-be lovers by Devil, who is doing the bidding of his master, the necromancer. Miranda is protected by Ariel from Stephano and Caliban. Ariel and Devil both employ magic to do their master's bidding, and both have much fun at the expense of the frustrated suitors.

Although Ariel has none of the saturnine qualities which Tennyson gives to his Devil, the relation between Magus, the magician, and Devil closely parallels that between Prospero and his obedient sprite. In both plays a mortal has complete control over a supernatural being. The speech of Ariel as he first appears before Prospero is the model for the first speech of Devil in Tennyson's play. [Of the parallel passages here quoted, Shakspeare's appear first. Shakspeare quotations are all from the revised Oxford Standard edition.]

I come
To answer thy best pleasure; be't to fly,
To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
On the curl'd clouds; to thy stronge bidding task
Ariel and all his quality. (*Tempest*, I, ii, 189-193.)

*I come, O I come, at the sound of my name
 From the depths and the caverns of Hell where I lie,
 I can rush through the torrent and ride on the flame
 Or mount on the whirlwind that sweeps thro' the sky—
 What wilt thou have me do for thee? (D&L, p. 2.)*

When Magus, in answer to the above speech explains that he merely wants Devil to guard Amoret, his wanton young wife, Devil's reply sounds like a speech of Hotspur's.

*By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
 To pluck bright honour from the pale-fac'd moon
 Or dive into the bottom of the deep.
 (Henry IV, Part I, I, iii, 201-203.)*

*I would do ought but this—I'd dive i' th' sea, . . .
 Or from the hornéd corners of the Moon
 I'd pluck the charmed flowers that flourish there; . . .
 I'd bring thee gems from out
 The stilly chambers of the mighty deep.⁶
 (D&L, p. 4.)*

Shakspere's magician and Tennyson's magician threaten their respective supernatural servants with identical punishments.

*If thou murmurest I will rend an oak
 And peg thee in its knotty entrails till
 Thou hast howled away twelve winters.
 (Tempest, I, ii, 294-296.)*

*Speak and beware the magic of my spells!
 Or I will rive yon mighty Cedar-Tree
 Sheer from its topmost windiest branch unto
 The lowest fang o' th' root—between each half
 I'll place thy sinful carcase and again
 When the cleft stem shall close without fissure
 Thy bunching body shall be quash'd as flat
 As spider in a hinge.
 (D&L, p. 60.)⁷*

Tennyson's "Stephanio, a Sailor" seems to have taken his name from the drunken butler of *The Tempest*, and his character from Stephano and the swaggering boatswain of *The Tempest*. The words *yare* and *yarely* are frequently on the boatswain's lips (*Tempest*, I, i, 5-7), as they are on Stephanio's (*D&L*, p. 60).⁸ Stephanio's first speech in *The*

Devil and the Lady is an echo of a line spoken by the Master of the ship in *The Tempest*.

Fall to 't yarely, or *we run ourselves aground*
(*Tempest*, I, i, 4.)

It seems *I've run aground here*
(*D&L*, p. 40.)

There is some similarity in plot between *Othello* and *The Devil and the Lady*.⁹ The scene in which Othello accuses Desdemona of infidelity is similar to the scene in *The Devil and the Lady* in which Magus expresses distrust of Amoret (*D&L*, pp. 8-9), but Amoret is much more glib in her protestations of innocence. Othello at one point trusts his wife's reputation to the watchfulness of Iago (*Othello*, I, iii, 285-301.), as Magus intrusts his wife to Devil (*D&L*, pp. 3-4.)

The character of Benedict the Monk, one of Amroet's suitors, is modeled on that of Shakspeare's Falstaff. Benedict is fat, sensual, and hypocritical. In addressing Falstaff, Prince Hal uses the following terms, which are echoed in Tennyson's play:

"Reverend vice"
"roasted Manning-Tree ox, with pudding in his belly"
"trunk of humours"
"whoreson, obscene greasy tallow-catch"
"Swollen parcel of dropsies"
"clay-brained guts"
(*Henry IV*, Part I, II, iv, 251-500)

"Top and pink of all morality"
"that demi-circle of entrails"
"hog in a high wind"
"barrel-bellied sanctity"
"fair, round juicy corporation"
"a fine cargo of guts."
(*D&L*, pp. 44-52.)

When the revelling suitors hear Magus approach, they direct Benedict to hide up the chimney (*D&L*, p. 58), a plan of escape which Falstaff considers when he hears Master Ford approaching (*Merry Wives of Windsor*, IV, ii, 56.)¹⁰

In addition to the character of Benedict, Tennyson ap-

pears to have taken the following phrases from Shakspeare's Falstaff scenes:

What tellest thou me of black and blue. *I was beaten myself into all the colors of the rainbow.*

(*Merry Wives*, IV, v, 112-113.)

There shall be no sound place within thy person;
*Thou shalt be all the colours of the rainbow.*¹¹

(*D&L*, p. 31.)

Yea, and to tickle our noses with speargrass to
make them bleed;

(*Henry IV*, Part I, II, iv, 340-341.)

What! have I ticked you? your nose drops blood.

(*D&L*, p. 56.)

When the doting Magus takes leave of Amoret early in Tennyson's play, the speeches recall the dialogue between Theseus and Hippolyta in the opening scene of *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

Theseus:

Now fair Hippolyta, our nuptial hour
Draws on apace; four happy days bring in
Another moon; but, oh, methinks, how slow
This old moon wanes! she hungers my desires,
Like to a stepdame or a dowager,
Long withering out a young man's revenue.

Hippolyta:

Four days will quickly steep themselves in nights,
Four nights will quickly dream away the time;
And then the moon like a silver bow
New bent in heaven, shall behold the night
Of our solemnities.

(*Midsummer Night's Dream*, I, i, 1-11.)

Amoret:

Alas! and when shall Heaven's auspicious breath
Restore thee to these longing eyes?

Magus:

E're yet again the silver moon shall fill
The curv'd radiance of her glowing horns.

Amoret:

How in thy tedious absence shall I chide
The lazy motion of the lagging hours?
Hours will seem days

(*D&L*, p. 8.)

Tennyson parodies a speech of Quince to Bottom in *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

You can play no part but Pyramus: for Pyramus is a sweet-faced man, a proper man, as one shall see in a summer's day; a most lovely, gentlemanlike man; therefore you must needs play Pyramus.
(*Midsummer Night's Dream*, I, ii, 87-91.)

I am an honest, true, and proper lover,
A gentle, comely, comfortable lover,
A well-proportioned and most gracious lover,
As ever woman set her eyes upon.
(*D&L*, p. 29.)

There are several echoes of *Romeo and Juliet* in *The Devil and the Lady*. In one instance Tennyson combines bits of Shaksperian dialogue.

Capulet:
How now, How now, how now, chop-logic!
(*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 150.)

Gregory:
Do you quarrel, sir?

Abraham:
Quarrel, sir! no, sir.
(*Romeo and Juliet*, I, i, 59-60.)

Antonio:
Do you chop logic with me, you dunderhead?

Pharmaceutus:
Who I, Sir, No, Sir.

Antonio:
Sirrah!
(*D&L*, p. 35.)

Devil, in Tennyson's play, chiding Amoret for her copious tears, uses a simile which Capulet had used in rebuking Juliet.

Thou counterfeit's a bark, a sea, a wind:
For still thy eyes, which I may call the sea,
Do ebb and flow with tears; the bark thy body is,
Sailing in this salt flood.
(*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 132-135.)

More yet? at this rate

You'd float a ship o' the line.
(*D&L*, p. 18.)

The several stychometric passages in *The Devil and the Lady* contain a number of puns in the Shaksperian manner. The following play upon *stalemate* apparently was taken from *The Taming of the Shrew*:

I pray you sir, is it your will
To make a stale of me among these mates?
(*Taming of the Shrew*, I, i, 57-58.)

Devil:
But I'll cry check to ye. I'll warrant
Ill prove a stalemate to ye.
Amoret:
In truth my mate is stale enough.¹²

Tennyson borrows the following word-play from Shakspeare:

But fish not with *this melancholy bait*
For *this fool-gudgeon*, this opinion.
(*Merchant of Venice*, I, i, 101-102.)

Why is the curv'd fish-hook buried in
The length of the twisting worm? *My gudgeons play*
Around the bated snare.
(*D&L*, p. 60.)

A number of Shaksperian epithets and descriptive phrases appear to have been called to mind by young Tennyson as he wrote his play. The following are examples:

My way of life
Is fall'n into the sear, *the yellow leaf*.
(*Macbeth*, V, iii, 22-23.)

Thou *yellowest leaf* on Autumn's wither'd tree!¹³
(*D&L*, p. 12.)

Though *the yesty waves*
Confound and swallow navigation up:
(*Macbeth*, IV, i, 53-54.)

For I forthwith upon the *yeasty wave* . . .
Shall now *embark*.
(*D&L*, p. 3.)

With *soft low tongue* and lowly courtesy
(*The Taming of the Shrew*, Induction, F, 114.)

Let there be . . .
No colloquy of *soft-tongued* whisperings
Like the *low hum* of the delighted bee
I' th' calyx of a lily.
(D&L, p. 18.)

His eyes were green as leeks
(*Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, i, 342.)

Squinting through *green leaky eyes*.
(D&L, p. 44.)

It is evident that Tennyson drew heavily upon his knowledge of Shakspeare's plays for the plot, characterization, and language of *The Devil and the Lady*.

Southwestern Louisiana Institute
Lafayette, Louisiana.

¹Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir* (New York, 1897), I, 5, 16, and 513.

²Alfred Tennyson, *The Devil and the Lady*, ed. Charles B. L. Tennyson (London, 1930), p. v.

³Edmund Blunden, *Nation and Athenaeum*, XLVI (1930), 705; *LTLS*, January 30, 1930, p. 75; *Oxford Magazine*, March 6, 1930, p. 587; St. J. Adcock, *Spectator*, February 8, 1930, p. 202.

⁴Adolf Fütting, *Tennyson's Jugenddrama* (Marburg, 1932), pp. 66-67, 73, 74.

⁵In the earliest extant manuscript of the play, the heroine is called *Jessica*, a name which Tennyson had found in *The Merchant of Venice*. Tennyson later changed the name to the more suitable *Amoret*. See *The Devil and the Lady*, p. vi.

⁶These boasting lines of Devil's strongly resemble a passage in Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* (V, v, 241-257), but I find no external evidence that Tennyson knew Fletcher at this time. Tennyson may have read Young's *Night Thoughts*, IV, 391-397, and the last speech in Milton's *Comus*, which present similar images.

⁷Cf. *Tempest*, I, ii, 274.

⁸Tennyson apparently had forgotten *The Devil and the Lady* when he expressed regret in 1872 that he had never used the word *yarely* in his poetry. (*Memoir*, II, 133.)

⁹As a child Tennyson read *Othello*, his first Shaksperian play (*Memoir*, I, 513.)

¹⁰Also noted by Fütting, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

¹¹Noted by Fütting, p. 74.

¹²Noted by Fütting, pp. 74-75.

¹³Tennyson had also probably read Byron, *On This Day I Complete My Thirty-Sixth Year*, I, 4, "My days are in the yellow leaf."

¹⁴For additional Shaksperian and Elizabethan phrases see Fütting, pp. 66, 67, 74.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

A SHAKSPERE CELEBRATION

On Sunday, the twenty-first of April of this year, an unusually successful Shakspeare celebration was held at the National Arts Club in the City of New York. Three Shakspeare associations co-operated, under the industrious and able guidance of Mr. Arthur Heine, to make this a memorable occasion. The Shakespeare Club of New York, now presided over by Mr. Charles Warburton, the Shakespeare Association of America, whose destinies are being guided by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, and the S. A. T. Shakespeare Reading Circle combined to participate in the celebration. More than 120 guests were present, all enthusiastic lovers of Shakspeare; the dinner was good; dress was informal; the speeches were short and clever, as well as witty; the singing was delightful; everybody looked and was happy. The program was as follows:

Address of welcome by Mr. Warburton; remarks by the Master of Ceremonies, Dr. Franklin Dunham; several Elizabethan songs by Mr. Winston Ross, accompanied by his mother, Fannie Swinburne; an extremely entertaining address by Godfrey Haggard, Consul General of Great Britain; an intensely dramatic and effective recitation of Hamlet's "rogue and peasant-slave" soliloquy by John Barrymore (at his best); a hilly-billy version of the Romeo and Juliet balcony scene by Robert Porterfield and Miss Kalata Humphries (a step-ladder serving as the balcony); comments by Sam Jaffe, a reading of a burlesque poem on Hamlet by Mr. Arthur Guiterman (the poem, not the play, by Mr. Guiterman); a bit of theatrical history by Dr. Milton Smith of the Morningside Players; more singing; and, finally, a simulated radio

broadcast of the Boar's-head Tavern scene from *Henry IV*, the artists being Charles Warburton, Alfred Shirley, William Beal, Guy Spaul, Robert Craven, John Parsons, Libby Wall and Winston Ross.

HAMLET'S 'SECT AND FORCE'

Laertes, Paris-bred gentleman, warns his innocent and unsuspecting sister against Hamlet's attentions. According to the 1604 Quarto (Q2) he instructs her (I, iii, 24-27) that Hamlet's protestations of love are to be believed only 'as he in his particuler act and place / May giue his saying deede, which is no further / Then the maine voyce of Denmarke goes withall.' The first Folio (F1) text varies from this in several important respects, reading 'As he in his peculiar Sect and force / May giue his saying deed:' etc. Q1 (1603) omits the passage.

It is generally taken for granted that 'particuler' of Q2 and 'peculiar' of F1 mean practically the same thing, and an editor's choice of one or the other word depends on which of the two primary texts he accepts as representing Shakespeare's intentions. But it is not so with 'act and place' *versus* 'sect and force.' Almost all editors of Hamlet have adopted the text of Q2. Only Rowe and Charles Knight seem to have adhered to F1; R. G. White kaleidoscoped the two texts and read 'peculiar sect and place,' defining 'sect' to mean 'class, rank, or, in the slang of society, set.' (See the Furness Variorum, vol. 1, page 62.) Unquestionably, 'act and place' gives a more obvious meaning than 'sect and force.' Collier thought that 'sect and force' might be 'strained into a meaning.' The Misses Porter and Clarke, in their edition of the play, cleverly explain 'peculiar sect and force' as meaning

'rank and influence, . . . the peculiar rank of a prince whose uncle has superseded him'; and they go so far as to say (p.199) that Q2's text is not nearly as significant or strong'. Most editors consider the Folio's reading so bad that they do not even mention it, much less attempt to explain it. Even Mr J. D. Wilson does not call it to the attention of students in his 1934 edition of the play.

In *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet* (page 48) Mr Wilson, citing this passage as an example of 'paraphrase' by the compositor, says (in his peculiar jargon) that 'the word *act* appears to have been misread *sect*, which at that period might be interpreted *sex*, and then *place* emended to *force* to suit the context thus created'. This cryptic suggestion perhaps means that Ophelia should take into consideration the force (driving power?) of Hamlet's peculiar sexual urge. That an Elizabethan compositor would have taken the liberty to emend what he did not understand is one of those fantastic notions which make Professor Wilson's texts and comments notorious.

That modern editors ought to retain the Folio text appears from the following considerations: (1) the words make tolerably good sense, (2) there is no certain instance of Shakespeare's use of 'sect' for 'sex' (Falstaff, in *2Henry IV*, may have used the word in the sense of 'class'), (3) the principle of *durior lectio* strongly favors the retention of the Folio reading, and (4) 'sect and force,' in secretary script, may easily be misread as 'act and place'.

Sect & force

act & place

In Gothic script an *a*, made with a curved infra-linear initial upstroke, may look exactly like *se*; hence 'act' may be misread 'sect,' especially if the penman happened to leave a gap in the descending part of the flourished initial curve (see facsimile). In 'place' and 'force' the last two letters are identical, secretary *a* was (and is) frequently mistaken for *or*, and the most common variety of secretary initial *f* can easily be written so as to be mistaken for *pl* because *l*'s (*i*'s, *b*'s, etc.) were often made without a loop (*i.e.*, without an initial ascender), and because the initial and descending portion of such an *f* could easily be written so that it resembled a secretary *p* (see facsimile).

'Particular' may be a misreading of 'peculiar' if, as frequently happened in the writing of Elizabethan penmen, the *p* and the *per* (or *par*) brevigraph were made alike, and if the letters *cu* were written with three vertical minims (as they should have been written), the first one somewhat taller than the other two, they would have been mistaken for *tic* (with an undotted *i* *).

SHAKSPERE'S WILL

A week or so ago a very respectable looking man introduced himself to us with something that he thought would be of great interest to American lovers of Shakespeare and especially to members of our Association. It was nothing less than what he described as an amazingly realistic facsimile of Shakespeare's last will and testament, including the notation on the back of the last page, which could be bought for the surprisingly small sum of fifty

Evident evidence tends to the conclusion that Shakespeare was one of those many Elizabethans who did not dot their *i*'s almost as a matter of principle.

cents The facsimiles, he said, are produced in France by a secret process which gives the document the exact appearance of an ancient, faded, yellowed, and frayed manuscript At first glance his sample seemed indeed to be all that he represented it to be. On careful examination we discovered the following imperfections. the bottom line of the text of pages 1 and 2 was missing, the facsimile was reduced by at least twenty-five percent, the ragged margins on the right side of the leaves were a great deal more ragged than in the original document (of which we have photographs), and the transcript accompanying the facsimile was lamentably inaccurate For scholarly purposes such a facsimile, it need hardly be said, is worthless; as a means of impressing the ignorant it may have some value.

SHAKSPERE IN MISCALOOSA

On page 180 of Dr. Esther C. Dunn's popularly well-received book *Shakespeare in America* one reads the following sentences:

"Miscaloosa was four hundred and eighty miles by water down the Black Water River from Mobile. Thither Ludlow and his company repaired for the summer of 1825. They played in the 'ballroom' of the hotel Miscaloosa boasted twenty-five hundred souls."

Even the general reader for whom this book was written (see the Preface) will be interested in the following comment on the above from Dr Bob Jones:

"I happen to have been born in Alabama and know something about the history and tradition of the state and this [*i.e.*, the above] sounded all wrong to me, but just to be sure I checked with the director of the state archives and history. There was never any place in Alabama called Mis-

caloosa. Miss Dunn evidently meant 'Tuscaloosa' There was never any *Black Water River*. Miss Dunn evidently meant the 'Black Warrior River,' upon which Tuscaloosa is situated. Anybody with even an elementary knowledge of American geography should know that Mobile is a port located at the mouth of the river, on the Gulf It is impossible to go from there *down* the river anywhere except into the Gulf itself. However, by going *up* the Mobile River into the Alabama, into the Tombigbee, into the Black Warrior, one reaches Tuscaloosa, a distance which the geographical survey of the state says is 395 miles."

THE FIRST AMERICAN ACTORS

Volume 48 of the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* contains an extremely interesting essay by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach about an important historical document which he obtained from the late Bertram T. Lee, a well-known collector of early Americana The document, written in Spanish, on six folio pages, on June 28, 1599, and duly notarized, consists of articles of agreement between nine persons, seven men and two women, to form and act as a troupe of actors for the production of plays in the "City of the Kings" [*i.e.*, Lima, Peru] as in the rest of the districts where it may be to [their] interest." The contract, "the earliest document known relative to the stage in America," was to run for three years; it bears (as the fine facsimile which accompanies the essay shows) the signatures of all the participants except the illiterate Isabel de Los Angeles, the wife of Francisco Perez de Robles (the manager and the prime mover of the company). Dr. Rosenbach feels that "these first American actors should be enrolled among the immortals of the New World," and we see no harm in doing so.

A UNIQUE SHAKSPERE ITEM

Early in 1920 the late Mr. Henry C. Folger, the founder of the magnificent Shakespeare Memorial Library in Washington, D. C., purchased a badly and sadly mutilated and incomplete copy of an early and hitherto unknown edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* which lacks (among others) the title-page. This highly interesting little pamphlet has just been published (in collotype facsimile, cloth-bound, pages lxiv + 64, \$4.) by Charles Scribner's Sons, of New York (597 Fifth Ave) for the trustees of Amherst College, with a scholarly and pleasantly readable introduction by Dr Joseph Q Adams, the director of the Library and one of America's foremost Shaksperians. The introduction tells the interesting story of the provenance of the little book and attempts, in some highly theoretical guessing, aided by bibliographical clues, to account for its history and mutilations, and succeeds in correcting a number of erroneous statements by John P Collier, Sidney Lee, William Jaggard, Justin Winsor, and Edmund K. Chambers regarding the bibliographic history of *The Passionate Pilgrim*. That this unique Folger item is in part a fragment of what is really the first edition of the poem may be accepted as highly probable, perhaps as proved; that in publishing it the knavish Jaggard—a thorough rascal, according to Dr. Adams—intended to deceive his customers into thinking that they were purchasing Shakspeare's "sugred sonnets" (of which Meres had written in 1598) is more than doubtful; that Jaggard

shrewdly fooled W. Leake or conspired with him "to offer along with his [1500] edition of *Venus and Adonis* an ostensible companion volume, *The Passionate Pilgrim*, by W. Shakspeare" as a means of accounting for the sale of the latter item at "the Greyhound in Paules Churchyard" is possible but not probable.

It is a pity that "G O," who may have been the original owner of the little vellum-bound volume containing this poem along with four others, has not been identified (The date of the binding also seems to be unascertainable). It is also a matter of regret that the poor remains of leaf C8 and of the other leaves which were torn out of the little book (possibly by some person who was disgusted with the obscene matter which a silly young man—Richard Fallows?—seems to have scribbled on them) have not been facsimiled. We say this because Dr Adams bases some of his theories on certain features of these remnants.

This book is one of the indispensable items in any Shaksperian collection.

A CORRECTION

At the top of the second column of Mr Dowlin's communication on page 256 of the October (1939) issue of our *Bulletin* there is a serious typographical error which we wish to correct. The passage should read thus:

The proverb was common throughout Europe, and no printed source is necessary to explain its presence in *As You Like It*, especially one so obscure as the octavo *Agamemnon* of 1566, in which edition only "W. R.'s" poem appears. Nevertheless, "W. R.'s" use of the proverb should be of interest to those investigating Elizabethan proverbs.

July, 1940

Vol. 15, No. 3

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



Baudelaire and Shakspeare

William Shakspeare, Botanist

Shakspeare and Music

The Continuity of Shaksperian Prose

The Roaring Boy in Tudor and
Stuart Literature



Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET
New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH
15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.
Major Edward Bowes
Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.
Hardin Craig, Ph.D.
Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.
Frank Gilmore
Walter Hampden
Frank J. Hogan
Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.
George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.
Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.
Fritz Leiber
Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.
Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.
John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.
Julia Marlowe, LL.D.
Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.
Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.M.
Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.
Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.
Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.
Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.
Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Otis Skinner, A.M.
Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.
John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison
70 Broadway
New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum
601 West 118th Street
New York

Board of Directors

1936

John Robert Gregg
Paul Kaufman
Robert M. Smith
Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1937

Miss Olive I. Carter
Arthur Heine
Frank L. Short
Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1938

George W. Davison
John E. Hannigan
John H. H. Lyon
Miss Charlotte E. Porter
A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS

ROBERT M. SMITH

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS

HARDIN CRAIG

WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON

VOL 15

JULY, 1940

No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| Baudelaire and Shakspeare | <i>Max I Baym</i> | 131 |
| William Shakspeare, Botanist | <i>Phyllis Cook</i> | 149 |
| Shakspeare and Music | <i>Mario Castelnovo-Tedesco</i> | 166 |
| The Continuity of Shaksperian Prose | <i>Henry W Wells</i> | 175 |
| The Roaring Boy in Tudor and Stuart Literature | <i>Burton Milligan</i> | 184 |
| A Note on 2 Henry IV | <i>Russell K. Alspach</i> | 191 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

BAUDELAIRE AND SHAKSPERE

By MAX I. BAYM

THE story of Shakspeare in France is a long one, and by this time an old one.¹ What English critics have thought of French criticisms of Shakspeare is another matter. I can only pause to indicate here that Coleridge for example, to whom Baudelaire is poetically indebted, thought that French criticisms of the Bard were "the judgment of monkeys, by some wonderful phenomenon put into the mouths of people shaped like men."²

Extremists and insular bias aside, French criticisms of, and reactions to, Shakspeare have always been interesting and sometimes important. What is surprising is the absence of Baudelaire's name in the history of these criticisms and reactions, especially between 1820 (*circa*), the year of the opening of the Romantic revival in drama, and 1870, a period corresponding to the life-course of the author of *Fleurs du Mal*. True, he never wrote a separate essay or study of Shakspeare, but that he was pre-occupied with, and influenced, by him is clear enough, as will appear from what follows in the present paper.

I.

Baudelaire was fully aware of the whole course of French criticism of Shakspeare, starting with Voltaire and running through Villemain and Victor Hugo. Of the first he said Emerson might have written a fine chapter entitled "Voltaire,³ ou l'anti-poète, le roi des badauds, le prince des superficiels"⁴; of the second, that he belonged to the clan of "pédagogues ignorants"⁵ and that his *Cours de littérature* was a "banal compendium worthy of a professor of rhetoric."⁶ What he had to say of Victor Hugo we shall see later.

Among his early literary admirations was Chateaubriand, whose essay entitled *Shakspeare ou Shakespeare* (1801) he unquestionably had read. Indeed, Baudelaire's essay on laughter (*De l'Essence du Rire*) owes a good deal to the essay of Chateaubriand. The latter points out that English comedy, starting from ridicule, ends by approaching pathos.

(In this connection Chateaubriand barely mentions Shakspeare's comedies, but refers to Sterne and Fielding). French comedy does directly the opposite. True humor, it would appear, is a distinctively English quality.⁷ In the main, Baudelaire agreed with this. For him, however, the problem was a far more complicated one—a problem into which we cannot go here. In Baudelaire's essay, too, we fail to find any references to Shakspeare; he refers, instead, to the "rire terrible de Melmoth"⁸—Melmoth "la grand création satanique du révérend Maturin."⁹

In 1821, the year of Baudelaire's birth, Guizot, in conjunction with Barante and Amidée Pichot, published a complete translation of Shakspeare, with a *Préface* by Guizot. This was, presumably, the first attempt in France, to criticize Shakspeare historically, not absolutely.¹⁰ Unfortunately, later Baudelaire did not think much of Guizot's translation; he called it "une pauvre traduction."¹¹

The years 1823-24 saw the publication of two important works: an essay on *Hamlet* by one of Guizot's collaborators, Barante, whom Baudelaire seemingly ignored, and *Racine et Shakespeare*, by Henri Beyle (Stendhal), whose work, in the main, he admired.¹² Speaking of Shakspeare, Stendhal also seemed to address himself to the future author of *Les Fleurs du Mal* and the apostle of *modernity* in art and literature: "Ce qu'il faut imiter de ce grand homme (*i.e.*, Shakspeare), c'est la manière d'étudier le monde au milieu duquel nous vivons."¹³

A poet-critic for whom Baudelaire had a chameleon-like admiration, running the gamut from the highest praise to the most intense denigration, was none other than Victor Hugo himself. "M. Victor Hugo," Baudelaire wrote in 1855, angered by the fact that he called Delacroix's women (*i.e.*, those he painted), frogs, "est un grand poete sculptural qui a l'oeil fermé à la spiritualité."¹⁴ Nevertheless, he did class him with Chateaubriand and Balzac,¹⁵ and asserted that, together with Sainte-Beuve and Alfred de Vigny, Hugo had rejuvenated or, better still, resuscitated French poetry, dead since the days of Corneille.¹⁶ In his article on *Théophile Gautier*, in 1859, he even went so far as to exclaim: "Nos voisins disent: Shakspeare et Goethe!

nous pouvons leur répondre: Victor Hugo et *Théophile Gautier*!"¹⁷ He recognized him as the poet elected to express through poetry 'the mystery of life.'¹⁸ He was nonplussed by his command of language. "Je vois que le lexique français, en sortant de sa bouche, est devenu un monde, un univers coloré, mélodieux et mouvant."¹⁹ How did this man come among us, he exclaims. "Perhaps it is simply because Germany had had Goethe and England Shakspeare and Byron that Victor Hugo was legitimately due to France."²⁰ Victor Hugo possessed not only greatness but universality,²¹ witness his epic-poem *la Légende des siècles*.

A good deal of this was said by Baudelaire in 1861.²² What he had to say in 1864, the year of the celebration of the tercentenary of Shakspeare's birth, is another matter and will be treated later. We must return to Hugo's *Préface* to his *Cromwell* (1827). Unquestionably, we have here another²³ important source for Baudelaire's conception of the *comic*, especially as it relates to the *grotesque*. Since space will not permit, we shall have to treat of Baudelaire's analysis of the *comic* elsewhere; for the moment, we relegate the matter to a footnote.²⁴ Suffice it to say here that his conception of the *comic* also involves a definition of the *grotesque*.²⁵ It will be recalled that for Hugo—and this was what Baudelaire read in the *Préface*—the characteristic quality of medieval and therefore of Romantic art is the 'grotesque.'²⁶ The grotesque and the beautiful blended to produce Shakspeare. Since (according to Hugo) the three successive stages of the literary art are the Ode, the Epic, and the drama, Shakspeare the dramatist represents the poetic summit of modern times; Shakspeare *is* the drama, the form proper to the third state of civilization, the literature of reality.²⁷

In the same year with the *Préface* of Hugo appeared Villemain's essay on Shakspeare. What Baudelaire thought of Villemain we have already been told.²⁸ Certainly he couldn't agree that Shakspeare was affected and belonged in England. Especially so, when the dicta came from a writer who, according to Baudelaire, "ignore l'art d'écrire une phrase, comme l'art de construire un livre."²⁹ A production, in the same year, of much greater moment, by a person whom Baudelaire held in infinitely greater esteem, was *Cinq-Mars* by Vigny. As is well known, the *Préface*

that accompanied it, dealt with *truth in art*. Vigny was for ideal rather than actual truth, and to this extent he was for Shakspeare and *his* art as over against the growing realism of Vigny's own day. What is necessary, Vigny argued, is not 'the authenticity of the facts, but the truth of the observation of human nature.'³⁰ Vigny's version of *Othello*—the acting of which rôle by Rouvière Baudelaire noticed favorably³¹—had a powerful influence on the French stage as well as on criticism in 1830. At least one of the points made by Alfred de Vigny in a letter he wrote regarding the production of this play, comported with Baudelaire's conception of the function of poetry: that it must be *modern*. Shakspeare? Yes. But, Vigny said, poetry must continue to 'correspond to the needs of the society in which the poet lives.'³²

1830 was, of course, the year of *Hernani*, and it is well to recall that in the years 1827-30 the French theatre was dominated by Hugo, and therefore, in a sense, by Shakspeare.³³ As Haines so well points out, Hugo's whole conception of tragedy—the 'Union of grandeur with truth'—is that which he has found in Shakspeare. It is this conception which he has written into the *Préface* of *Cromwell* as well as into his book, *Shakespeare*, and it is from the former of these works that Baudelaire derived some of his ideas of laughter as well as of poetry.

I have thus given you, rather sketchily it is true, the French background against which Charles Baudelaire as a young boy in school came to be concerned with matters literary, especially as they turned on the English Bard.

II.

Actually, the future translator of Poe and De Quincey learned the tongue in which Shakspeare wrote from his mother, who was born in London of French parents. As a young man he studied English while at college; though, it might be added, he failed to get honorable mention in it.³⁴ Thus, before the age of 18 (he took his Bachelor's degree in 1839) he was conversant with many English authors³⁵ in the original, Shakspeare among them.

His college days over, he spent the years 1839-41 in

Paris, where, as can be readily understood from the history of the period, he moved in a romantic atmosphere charged with the enigma (as Ferran puts it) of the Evil One in the various forms of Milton's Satan: René, Lara, Herani, Antony, Faust,³⁶ Mephistopheles, Poe, Balzac, 'Melmoth,'³⁷ Lélia, Walpole's *Castle of Otranto*, Anne Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho*, Hoffmann,³⁸ and, we must add, *Hamlet*.³⁹ It was in this atmosphere and out of this entourage that his conception of the *comic* and of laughter was to emerge; a conception according to which it is the Devil who manipulates the strings which motivate us, while he amuses himself cruelly in bringing about our fall through a volatilization of the metal of our will.⁴⁰

During this period also, he fell under the spell of the *Poésies de Joseph Delorme*, as many others of his generation did. "J'ai partout feuilleté le mystère profond de ce livre," he says in a poem which he sent Sainte-Beuve in 1844. It was in reading these poems of Sainte-Beuve⁴¹ that the eager young poet came upon the *Sonnet*, Imité de Wordsworth, the first stanza of which reads:

*Ne ris point des sonnets, O critique moqueur!
Par amour autrefois en fit le grand Shakspeare;
C'est sur ce luth heureux que Pétrarque soupire,
Et que le Tasse aux feux soulage un peu son coeur.*⁴²

He certainly must have noted especially the poem *Retour de la Poésie*,⁴³ in which Hamlet is mentioned and where Hamlet's fate is compared by Sainte-Beuve (or Delorme) to that of *the Poet in general*. In the *Pensées*⁴⁴ of the same volume of poems Baudelaire came upon the passage⁴⁵ in which Delorme criticises the literary critics of his day. He says that because they laud Shakspere one day they feel that they must pass severe judgments on other authors the next day, even if one of them be Racine. How well this seemed to fit the case of Stendhal, who in his book *Shakespeare et Racine* damned the latter⁴⁶ in order to praise the former.

After a year of travel (1841-42) the young poet, who was already busy with some of the *Fleurs du Mal* poems, settled in his Parisian lodgings at the Hôtel de Pimodan. There the walls were covered with a whole series of Delacroix lithographs dealing with *Hamlet*; a central place was

given to a head symbolizing *la Douleur*⁴⁷ Almost contemporaneous with his discovery of the work of Poe (1846-7), was his acquaintance with Eugène Delacroix, under the spell of whose Shaksperianism he soon fell. There were others at the time who were infected with that spirit. Thus Mantz, in the *Artiste* for Feb., 1847, called Delacroix "Le premier parmi les maîtres violents et dramatiques, . . . le peintre de toutes les souffrances, de toutes les inquiétudes, un vrai fils de Shakespeare."⁴⁸

If Poe and De Maistre had taught Baudelaire (as he himself averred) to 'raisonner', Delacroix had helped him to approach the very source of the modern spirit in which reason battles with itself in a tumult of emotion and passion: *Hamlet* (and its author).⁴⁹

Into this source, and out of it, the intellectual and creative currents that caught Baudelaire's spirit, seemed to have their influx and efflux. In it was the spirit of tragedy, and the *grotesque* which helped to feed it. Out of it (with the aid of Poe and Hoffman) came the multiverse comprehension of tragedy through an *aesthetic of correspondences*,⁴⁹ the vision of the *universal analogy*⁵⁰ in the light of which the natural world appears as the reproduction of the spiritual world,—an appearance which it is the business of poetic genius to interpret; and (through Emerson) the idea that "The hero is he who is immovably central"⁵¹—an idea implicit in Shakspeare's tragic heroes.⁵² Out of it, too, came that very 'goût du malheur', which, according to Ferran, gives to Baudelaire's aesthetic its mark of originality.⁵³

Baudelaire's early reputation as a writer was first gained by writing of Delacroix's paintings in the *Salons* of 1845 and '46. Drawing his subjects for painting from Dante and Shakspeare,⁵⁴ Delacroix himself seemed to step out of the pages of one or the other. His treatment of anguish in Shakspeare, in his painting *les Adieux de Roméo et Juliette*, for example, expressed for Baudelaire the painter's own

Delacroix quotes in his *Mémoires* (Vol. III, p. 240-Jan. 4, 1860) from Chæaubriand's *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe* "Shakspeare est au nombre des cinq ou six écrivains qui ont suffi au besoin et l'aliment de la pensée. Ces génies mères semblent avoir enfanté et allaité tous les autres."

anguish. Delacroix's strange and persistent melancholy made him the characteristic painter of the 19th century. It was this, Baudelaire thought, that explained his affinity for Dante and Shakspeare, "deux autres grands peintres de la douleur humaine," two masters he knew well enough to translate into his own medium. One must not imagine for one moment that either the poetic critic, Baudelaire, or the painter-poet, Delacroix, was guilty of the aesthetic scrambling of the arts. The true painter takes from the poets that which is visually colorful. Thus, the true painter's 'préfèrent Shakespeare à Arioste'. This would also explain Delacroix's penchant for Shakspeare. The following table represents the number of subjects Delacroix drew from him for painting:

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | each from <i>King Lear</i> and <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> |
| 2 | from <i>Macbeth</i> |
| 3 | from <i>Othello</i> |
| 7 | from <i>Hamlet</i> |
| 16 | from <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> |
| — | |
| 30 | in all ⁵⁵ |

Baudelaire's description (in his *Salon de 1846*) of Delacroix's *Les Adieux de Roméo et de Juliette* deserves at least part quotation:

"Roméo et Juliette,—sur le balcon,—dans les froides clartés du matin, se tiennent religieusement embrassés par le milieu du corps. Dans cette étreinte violente de l'adieux, Juliette, les mains posées sur les épaules de son amant, rejette la tête en arrière, comme pour respirer, ou par un mouvement d'orgueil et de passion joyeuse . . .;—ce mouvement vigoureux de la nuque est particulier aux chiens et aux chats heureux d'être caressés.—Les vapeurs violacées du crépuscule enveloppent cette scène et le paysage romantique qui la complète."⁵⁶

One great merit he found in Delacroix was that he was essentially literary. Today art-critics would hardly consider this a virtue in a painter. Baudelaire, however, belonged to the school of literary art criticism, and in its estimate Delacroix gained in stature through his ability to translate the Bible, Ariosto, Byron, Goethe, Dante, Walter Scott, and Shakspeare into his own language, that of the

painter. For Baudelaire he was "le type du peintre-poète."⁵⁷ He even goes so far as to say: ". . . nul, après Shakspeare, n'excelle comme Delacroix à fondre dans une unité mystérieuse le drame et la rêverie."⁵⁸

Baudelaire's thinking in matters of aesthetics very often coincides with Delacroix's, especially in related problems. Two such problems are those of the *grotesque* (or the 'comique absolu') and *dis-proportion* as conditions of artistic beauty. As for the former, we have seen⁵⁹ that Baudelaire placed it at the very heart of the creative process⁶⁰ and therefore of beauty, and that in doing so, he was indebted to Victor Hugo who said that the grotesque and the beautiful blended to produce Shakspeare.⁶¹ Now as for *disproportion*,—can it be productive of beauty? Or, to use Delacroix's words: "La disproportion serait-elle une condition pour l'admiration?" His answer, couched in question form, is: "Si, d'une part, Mozart, Cimarosa, Racine étonnent moins, à cause de l'admirable proportion de leurs ouvrages, Shakespeare, Michel-Ange, Beethoven ne devront-ils pas une partie de leur effet à une cause opposée? Je le crois pour mon compte."⁶² If Baudelaire thought highly of Delacroix, the latter thought no less of the former, as several entries in the painter's *Mémoires* clearly indicate. He tells of some visits from the poet and adds: "Ses vues me paraissent des plus modernes et tout à fait dans le progrès."⁶³ Side by side with this entry we have another one which concerns the question of Shakspeare in France: "Mercredi, 4 avril 1849 . . . Beaucoup causé musique avec Armand Bertin. *Parlé de Racine et de Shakspeare*. Il croit qu'on aura beau faire dans ce pays, on en reviendra toujours à ce qui a été le beau une fois pour notre nation; je crois qu'il a raison. Nous ne serons jamais shakspeariens. Les Anglais sont tout Shakespeare. Il les a presque faits tous ce qu'ils sont, en tout."⁶⁴ This almost sounds like Villemain's pronouncement that Shakspeare belonged in England and not in France; but the tone is neither as cantankerous nor certainly as chauvinistic. Baudelaire, who could not stand the juxtaposition of the names of Hugo and Delacroix, as leaders in the Romantic movement, would have reviled the coupling of the two names in their respective reactions to Shakspeare.

These, then, were the thoughts on Shakspeare that Baudelaire expressed in the course of his criticism of Delacroix's works, or that came to him from his contemplation of them. We turn now to the reflection of the Bard's work in Baudelaire's own creative output.

III.

Practically his first published work, *La Fanfarlo*,⁶⁵ is a novelette in which the story of Samuel Cramer is really that of Charles Baudelaire. A self-directed irony runs through this story. The poet in this work, Baudelaire tells us, has made a "recueil de sonnets, comme nous en avons tous fait et tous lu, dans le temps où nous avions le jugement si court et les cheveux si longs."⁶⁶

Consider the Hamlet-like quality and tone of the following monologue in *La Fanfarlo*,⁶⁷ addressed by the hero to a lady. "Madame, pity me, or rather pity us, for there are many brethren of my sort. It is hatred of all and of ourselves which led us to these lies. It is out of despair at our inability to be noble and beautiful in a natural way that we have so bizarrely made up our faces. We have devoted ourselves so assiduously to sophisticating our hearts, we have so persistently abused the microscope for the purpose of studying the hideous excrescences of our hearts, whose sores we enlarge at pleasure, that it has become impossible for us to speak the language of ordinary men . . . We have altered the very accent of nature . . . We have psychologized like madmen who augment their own madness in straining to understand it. Cursed, thrice cursed be the infirm parents who begat us rachitic and ill-born."⁶⁸

What have we here but the thinly disguised outcry of "Wormwood, wormwood!"⁶⁹ on the part of the future author of *Flowers of Evil*.

It was Maxwell Bodenheim who pointed out in one of his early poems that we all like to play Hamlet. That rôle is very often played by some of us unconsciously; others are provoked to the antics of the melancholy Dane by a definite set of circumstances, which, in the case of Baudelaire, make the identification clear and conscious.

The events in Baudelaire's family early predisposed him to the Hamlet rôle, and that motif was to sound 'throughout the disordered symphony of the poet's life.'⁷⁰ Like his great literary prototype, he too 'could not forget or forgive what he called his mother's infidelity to the memory of his father.'⁷¹ He could never be reconciled to General Aupick, his stepfather. He too could say, "But I have that within which passeth show. These but the trappings and the suits of woe."⁷² Ferran definitely refers to Baudelaire's "amour d'une mère: la jalousie hamletienne," and says further: "Farouche Hamlet, le petit Charles voue à l'intrus (*i.e.*, de M.Aupick) une haine dont les biographes se font l'écho."⁷³

Yes, Cramer (in *La Fanfarlo*) is Baudelaire looking in the mirror of his imagination and beholding himself as Hamlet. (Not, we add in parenthesis, the foolish Hamlet of Dumas and Paul Meurice's play, which appeared the same year as *La Fanfarlo*, and in which the hero escaped the poisoned rapier to enjoy a long life and a merry one on the throne of Denmark).⁷⁴

While the *Flowers of Evil* were growing and being gathered into an unforgettable bouquet, Baudelaire was busy assimilating the sombre spirit of Poe's stories as well as the lucidity and brilliance of his philosophy of poetic composition. I am referring to Baudelaire's translation as an assimilation, since he himself regarded it as such. "Savez-vous pourquoi j'ai patiemment traduit Poe? *Parce qu'il me ressemblait*."⁷⁵ He could not say this of Shakspeare, for his feeling about the Bard was precisely the feeling he had for Hamlet. That feeling was articulated for him by Hugo. When reviewing *Les Misérables* (in 1862), he quoted the following from the *Préface* to *Marie Tudor*, because it apparently expressed what he himself felt: "The stumbling-block of the *true* is the small or petty; the stumbling-block of the great is the false. Admirable, all-powerful poet! He creates things higher than ourselves, which, however, exist even as we do. Hamlet, for example, is as true as any of us, but greater. Hamlet is colossal, and yet real. And that is because Hamlet is neither you nor I, but all of us. Ham-have here a clue to why he did not attempt the translation let is not *a man*; he is *Man*."⁷⁶ Psychologically, then, we

of Shakspere, whereas he did translate Poe⁷⁷ and de Quincey.

This is not the time to dwell on Baudelaire and Poe; but we must make one point which is important here for our purpose. We wish to emphasize a link, which obviously has its roots in Shakspere and reveals the American and French poets using a common source. We know that Baudelaire read with great care and admiration Poe's *Philosophy of Composition* as well as his *The Poetic Principle*.⁷⁸ The former contains the telling phrase of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* passage on the Poet. "Most writers," Poe says, "poets in especial, prefer having it understood that they compose by a species of *fine frenzy*—an ecstatic intuition,"⁷⁹ etc. Later on (sometime between 1862 and 1864), in his *Mon Coeur Mis à Nu*, Baudelaire puts it down as a sort of self-imposed goal or program: "Trouver la *frénésie* journalière"—this, on the very page in which he asserts, "De Maistre et Edgar Poe m'ont appris à raisonner."⁸⁰

In *Bénédiction*, a poem in the *Spleen et Idéal* series of *Fleurs du Mal*, there is more than a shadow of awareness of that passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in which the triune identification of the lunatic, the lover, and the poet is made. They are all alike, madmen with 'seething brains' and 'shaping fantasies, that apprehend / More than cool reason ever comprehends.'⁸¹ Mothers who beget such have no reason to rejoice, and certainly that would be true of the mother who gives birth to a poet. Listen to Baudelaire anent this:

Lorsque, par un décret des puissances suprêmes,
Le Poète apparaît en ce monde ennuyé,
Sa mère épouvantée et pleine de blasphèmes
Crispe ses poings vers Dieu, qui la prend en pitié;
"Ah! que n'ai-je mis bas tout un noeud de vipères,
Plutôt que de nourrir cette dérision!
Maudite soit la nuit aux plaisirs éphémères
Où mon ventre a conçu mon expiation!"⁸²

But, once he is born—and we must forget the discomfiture of the unfortunate mother—we find that the poet, partaking of the nature of his other two mad brethren, is 'of imagination all compact.' What his case is like is stated more fully thus:

The poet's eye, in a *fine frenzy* rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name

By way of aesthetic coda, the Bard reflects:

Such tricks hath strong imagination,
That, if it would but apprehend some joy,
It comprehends some bringer of that joy,
Or in the night, imagining some fear,
How easy is a bush suppos'd a bear!

We have, then, the paradoxical circumstance of evil being the fertile ground for good; the madman as a bringer of joy—les fleurs du mal

Turning again to Baudelaire, we find the condition of the ill-begotten poet or madman expressed as follows:

*Pourtant, sous la tutelle invisible d'un Ange,
L'Enfant déshérité s'envie de soleil,
Il joue avec le vent, cause avec le nuage
Et s'envie en chantant du chemin de la croix.
Et l'Esprit qui le suit dans son pèlerinage
Pleure de le voir gai comme un oiseau des bois.
Tous ceux qu'il veut aimer l'observent avec crainte,
Et s'accusent d'avoir mis leurs pieds dans ses pas.⁸³*

Add to the above this stanza from *l'Albatros*, which echoes De Vigny, whom Baudelaire greatly admired, and who was himself a great admirer of Shakspeare:

*Le Poète est semblable au prince des nuées
Qui hante la ténête et se rit de l'archer,
Exilé sur le sol au milieu des brutes,
Ses ailes de géant l'empêchent de marcher.⁸⁴*

We have here at least a suggestion of the *wild-genius-frenzy* conception of the poet.

Undoubtedly, for Baudelaire the chief significance of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* intermezzo on the nature of the Poet was to be found in the central position occupied by the imagination in the creative process. He found in this centrality a corrective of what he considered an aesthetic error in the whole romantic movement: the use of the term, *Poetry of the heart* (*La poésie du coeur!*), and the attribu-

tion to it of a kind of infallibility. "On donnait ainsi," he says, "plein droit à la passion Combien de contre-sens et de sophismes peut imposer à la langue française une erreur d'esthétique! Le coeur contient la passion, le coeur erreur d'esthétique! Le coeur contient la passion, le coeur contient le dévouement, le crime; l'Imagination seule contient la poésie."⁸⁵ Incidentally, those who have read the fascinating *Mémoires* of Delacroix will recall his recurrent prose-songs to Imagination.⁸⁶ The two men, the painter and the poet, had so many thoughts in common, especially as they touched on the universal source of artistic creation. For both, the antinomy between art and science is resolved in Baudelaire's idea that "The imagination is the queen of truth" and so of the human faculties, because it "draws upon the inexhaustible source of analogy."⁸⁷

So much, then, for the rapprochement between *Les Fleurs du Mal* and Shakspeare on the subject of *Imagination*. The next link between the two is one that we might readily expect to find in the work of a poet who had read the translated De Quincey and was therefore made further aware of *Macbeth* by reading De Quincey's well-known essay *On the Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth*.⁸⁸ Indeed, according to G. T. Clapton, Baudelaire's '*beauté du mal*' and "*le goût de l'infini*"—two basic ideas in his poetry—owe a good deal to the author of *Murder as a Fine Art* (1827).⁸⁹ The more inclusive truth is, of course, that both owed such ideas to the author of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. And for '*douleur*', Baudelaire was certainly indebted to the writer, who knew the grief of losing an only son, and who put into the mouth of Constance, who is 'as fond of grief as of (her) child', these words:

Grief fills the room up of my absent child,
Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me,
Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
Remembers me of all his gracious parts,
Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form;
Then, have I reason to be fond of grief?"⁹⁰

Simultaneously with his reading of De Quincey, Baudelaire was writing on *Delacroix* and his paintings drawn from *Macbeth*.⁹¹ He was also more than looking into Stendhal's *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, where, while talking

of "les scènes touchantes produites par les passions,"⁹² Stendhal refers to Shakspeare and to Macbeth.⁹³ Concerned with the 'vaporisation . . . du Moi,'⁹⁴ he started, after the fashion of Poe's *Marginalia*, *Mon Coeur Mis à Nu*.⁹⁵ But, it is in the poem *L'Idéal*, that we get the most pointed expression of that heart which was being consumed in so many different artistic ways. In that poem he says:

*Ce qu'il faut à ce coeur profond comme un abîme,
C'est vous, Lady Macbeth, âme puissante au crime* 96

The parallelism between the next two passages—the one from *Les Fleurs du Mal* and the other from the *Sonnets* of Shakspeare—may have escaped the attention of scholars because of contrast in the midst of similarity. I quote first from the last two stanzas of *Les Sept Vieillards*, a poem dedicated to Victor Hugo:

*Exaspéré comme un ivrogne qui voit double,
Je rentrai, je fermai ma porte, épouvanté,
Malade et morfondu, l'esprit fiévreux et troublé,
Blessé par le mystère et par l'absurdité!
Vainement ma raison voulait prendre la barre:
La tempête en jouant dérouterait ses efforts.
Et mon âme dansait, dansait, vieille gabare
Sans mâts, sur une mer monstrueuse et sans bords!*⁹⁷

Now take Sonnet XXIX:

When, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
I all alone beweepe my outcast state,
And trouble deaf heaven with my bootless cries,
And look upon myself and curse my fate,
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,

Desiring this man's art and that man's scope,
With what I most enjoy contented least,
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
Like to the lark at break of day arising,
From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate etc

To say the least, it is quite obvious that we have here a recurrent poetic theme,⁹⁸ where the central mood is recognizable as common to both poems. But, of course, we have in Shakspeare's sonnet the contrasting element of love dispelling the mood of depression and breaking into a hymn of joy. By the time the theme gets to Baudelaire, Shakspeare's neo-Platonism is consumed in the cauldron of 19th-century pes-

simism and introspection. We have the Baudelairean influence predominating over the Shaksperian idea, as it were. Our theme becomes, then, more rightly defined by the caption *Baudelaire and Shakspeare* rather than the title in reverse.

[To be concluded]

¹Haines, C. M., *Shakespeare in France, Criticism, Voltaire to Victor Hugo* London, 1925.

²Raynor, Thomas Middleton, ed., *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*. Cambridge. 1930, Vol. II, 169 (As reported by J. P. Collier)

³Emerson left Voltaire out of his *Representative Men*.

⁴Baudelaire, Charles *Oeuvres*. Texte Établi et annoté par Y. G. Le Dentec. Paris, N. d. p. 651.

⁵*Ibid.*, II, 610 ⁶*Ibid.*, 587 ⁷Haines, 91 ⁸Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 174. ⁹*Ibid.* 171 ¹⁰Haines, 109 ¹¹Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 763

¹²Baudelaire was fond of quoting Stendhal's definition of Beauty. "*Le Beau n'est que la promesse du bonheur*" (*Ibid.*, 327).

¹³Quoted in Rhodes, S.A., *The Cult of Beauty in Baudelaire*. N. Y., 1929, I, 128.

¹⁴Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 161. ¹⁵*Ibid.*, 461.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 463.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 478

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 520.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 521.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 522.

²¹*Ibid.*

²²*Ibid.*, 517-529 (In *Réflexions sur Quelques-uns de mes Contemporains* Victor Hugo)

²³The first source is that of Chateaubriand. *Vide ante* 1

²⁴For Baudelaire the comic is, from an artistic point of view, an imitation; the grotesque, a creation. We quote from his *De l'Essence du Rire*: "Le comique est une imitation mêlée d'une certaine faculté créatrice, c'est-à-dire d'une idéalité artistique. Or, l'orgueil humain . . . qui est la cause naturelle du rire dans le cas du grotesque, devient aussi cause naturelle du rire dans le cas du grotesque, qui est une création mêlée d'une certaine faculté imitatrice, d'éléments pré-existants dans la nature . . . Dans ce cas-là le rire est l'expression de l'idée de supériorité, non plus de l'homme sur l'homme, mais de l'homme sur la nature. . . Le rire causé par le grotesque a en soi quelque chose de profond, d'axiomatique et de primitif qui se rapproche beaucoup plus de la vie innocente et de la joie absolue que le rire causé par le comique de mœurs. . ." This grotesque Baudelaire chooses to call the 'comique absolu' by contrast (he says) to the 'comique ordinaire', which he calls the 'comique significatif.' (*Oeuvres*, II, 175)

²⁵Incidentally, Bergson is considerably indebted to Baudelaire for his analysis of laughter.

²⁶Nowhere in his *Préface* does Hugo define the grotesque directly. One gathers his meaning from a series of inter-locking ideas, which may be enumerated as follows:

1 Christianity led poetry (the Muse) to see that not everything in creation is humanly beautiful, that the ugly exists side by side with the beautiful, the grotesque with the sublime.

2 The grotesque—an element foreign to antiquity—is a new type introduced into Poetry. Its form is that of comedy

3. Actually, then, the grotesque is the ugly incorporated in an art form.

4 The fertile union of the grotesque with the sublime gives birth (according to Hugo) to modern genius which in its complexity is opposed to the uniform simplicity of the genius of antiquity. (This is the difference between *classic* and *romantic* literature).

5 The grotesque did exist among the ancients, but occupied a recessive place. In

modern thought and art, on the contrary, its rôle is immense. It is everywhere. It makes Sganarelle dance about Don Juan and Mephistopheles around Faust.

6 As an element of contrast, the grotesque is, according to Hugo, the richest source that nature can open to art. It is a term of comparison as well as of departure from which one may rise to the beautiful with a fresher and keener perception.

7 In the drama, which represents (for Hugo) the summit of poetic development and of which Shakspeare is in turn the summit, the sublime and the grotesque interlink as they do in life and in creation.

8. The two rival geniuses—the grotesque and the sublime—unite their double flame and from this flame emerges Shakspeare. [*Vide Préface de Cromwell, passim*]

²⁷Haines, 131, Hugo's *Préface de Cromwell, passim*

²⁸*Vide ante*, 1

²⁹Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 585 (L'Esprit de M. Villemain)

³⁰Haines, quoted in 139

³¹In a necrologic article, in *La Petite Revue*, Oct. 28, 1865 (*Vide Baudelaire, Oeuvres* II note, 782, and 612-613)

³²Haines, 143.

³³Haines, 145

³⁴Ferran, *André L'Esthétique de Baudelaire*. Paris, 1933, pp. 7, 159

³⁵Shelley, Byron, Keats, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Scott, Maturin, Lewis, Anne Radcliffe, Walpole, Milton, Gray, Young, Tennyson, Longfellow, Emerson, Poe, Sterne, Cowper, and, of course, Shakspeare

³⁶Translated by Gérard de Nerval in 1828 (Ferran, 87)

³⁷Balzac called Maturin one of the greatest geniuses of Europe (Ferran, 87)

³⁸First translated into French by Loève-Weimars, 1830-33. Gautier wrote on Hoffmann (Ferran, 88)

³⁹Ferran, 86, 87.

⁴⁰Ferran, 89.

⁴¹*Vie, Poésies, et Pensées de Joseph Delorme*. Bruxelles, 1837, ed'n 2

⁴²*Ibid*, 243

⁴³*Ibid*, 89

⁴⁴In the *Pensée* IV, Delorme mentions a French translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (p. 269). He uses a few lines spoken by Mercutio to illustrate his discussion of the Alexandrine form.

⁴⁵*Pensées*, XIV, p. 288.

⁴⁶Actually Baudelaire believed in, and admired, the "Puissance de l'analyse scientifique" (See *Oeuvres*, II, 435).

⁴⁷Ferran, pp. 88, 152, 194.

⁴⁸Ferran, 256

⁴⁹Baudelaire, II, 71, 521, 471

⁵⁰*Ibid*, 521 and 471. In the main, Ferran denies Poe's poetic influence on B., though he admits that P. and B., in common with many other poets and philosophers, shared the notion of the *Universal Analogy*, i.e., that the natural world is the reproduction of the spiritual world and that poetic genius interprets this analogy (Ferran, 175 and 194).

⁵¹Ferran, 199. According to Ferran, he also knew Emerson's *Representative Men* and *The Conduct of Life*.

⁵²Except, of course, that their centrality is disturbed by a *tragic fault*

⁵³Ferran, 212.

⁵⁴As early as 1846 (Salon of 1846) Baudelaire considered that Delacroix's taste for both Dante and Shakspeare constituted a perfect balance. He linked Delacroix's Pieta of that year with his *Hamlet* (See Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 80, 82). His *Hamlet*, Baudelaire said, was so much railed at and so little understood (*Oeuvres*, II, 84, 85).

⁵⁵This table is drawn from the *Appendix* of the 3-volume *Mémoires* of Eugène Delacroix, a veritable mine of important and fascinating information of the period. Incidentally, Mr. Pach's translation is amusing and useful only to the casual reader. The student cannot afford to substitute the translation for the original.

⁵⁶Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 84.

⁵⁷*Ibid*, 237 (also 163).

⁵⁸*Ibid*, 160.

⁵⁹*Vide ante*.

⁶⁰Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 183 ('De L'Essence du Rire', *passim*).

⁶¹*Vide ante*

⁶²Delacroix, Eugène, *Journal de Paris*, 1893, II, 187, 188

⁶³*Ibid*, I, 342 (Feb 5, 1849).

⁶⁴*Ibid*, I, 361

⁶⁵Published 1847

⁶⁶Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, I, 533

⁶⁷*Ibid*, 534.

⁶⁸We have translated freely

⁶⁹*Hamlet*, III, ii, 191

⁷⁰*The Poems and Prose Poems of Charles Baudelaire*, with an Introductory Preface by James Huneker. Bientano N. Y. ed), xxvii

⁷¹*Ibid*, XLII

⁷²*Hamlet*, I, ii, 85-6

⁷³Ferran, 671, 7

⁷⁴Haines, p 147. This version of the play ends with the reappearance of the ghost, in the rôle of a *deus ex machina*, to announce the good news of Hamlet's escape from death. And to think that it was Dumas who said that, after God, Shakspeare had created most (161)

⁷⁵Baudelaire, *Lettres*, 1841-1866, p 362.

⁷⁶Our free translation from Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 580

⁷⁷Baudelaire first got to know the work of Poe in 1846. In 1847 Isabelle Meunier had published in *la Démocratie Pacifique* a translation of Poe. In 1848, one year after the appearance of his *La Fanfarlo*, Baudelaire first translated Poe for *La Liberté de Pensée* (15 July). In 1852, when the *Revue de Paris* printed his *Edgar Poe, Sa Vie et Ses Ouvrages*, Taine praised Baudelaire's translation. According to Symons, his translations came (more or less) in this order: *Histoires Extraordinaires*, 1856; *Nouvelles Hist Ext*, 1857; *Adventures d'A Gordon Pym*, 1858; *Eureka*, 1864; *Histoires Grotesques et Sérieuses*, 1865. (See Symons, Arthur, *Charles Baudelaire, A Study*, London, 1920, p. 41). There are no references to Shakspeare in Baudelaire's *Edgar Allen Poe, Sa Vie et Ses Ouvrages*. The references to Shakspeare in Poe's own work are as follows.

I Letter to Mr. ——— (241, 242, 247), 1831. There is a caustic reference here to fools who have a high opinion of Shakspeare though they have never read him, their opinion is only a derivative from 'a few gifted individuals, who kneel around the summit, beholding, face to face, the master spirit who stands upon the pinnacle' (242). Then Poe scores the scholar who, when asked for a definition of Poetry, runs to Dr Johnson for a definition 'Shade of the immortal Shakspeare! I ungained to myself the scowl of your spiritual eye upon the profanity of that scurrilous *Ursa Major*. Think of poetry, dear B——, think of poetry, and then think of ——— Dr. Samuel Johnson! Think of all that is airy and fairy-like, and then of all that is hideous and unwieldy; think of his huge bulk, the Elephant! and then ——— then think of the Tempest—the *Midsummer Night's Dream*—Prospero—Oberon—and Titania." (247-8). Then Poe goes on to state what, in his opinion, a poem is. He finds music *essential* to it—"the idea without the music is prose," etc. He adds the question, "What was meant by the invective against 'him who had no music in his soul'—from *The Merchant of Venice*, V, i, 81-8 (248).

II *Tortesa, The Usurer*. A Play by N. P. Willis, Samuel Colman, New York (A review by Poe, pub in Burton's *Gentleman's Magazine*, Aug. 1839). "The old manoeuvre of the sleeping draught calls '*Romeo and Juliet*' somewhat too forcibly to mind. The idea, too, of the deception practised upon Tortesa by means of the portrait is borrowed apparently from the '*Winter's Tale*', and is, moreover, absurd. No person could have been thus deceived. . . ." (284)

III *Al Aaraaf*, Pt. II, L 60 "Young flowers were whispering in melody." Poe's own note to this line of his poem was: "Fairies use flowers for their charactery—*Merry Wives of Windsor*, V, v, 70." (487).

IV *The Sleeper*, line 26. "Above the closed and fringed lid." Prof. Kullis Campbell compares for 'fringed lid' *The Tempest*, I, ii, 40—"The fringed curtain of thine eye advance." (494)

V *The Bells*, line 50. "By the side of the pale-faced moon." For the 'pale-faced moon' we are referred to *Henry IV*, I, iii, 202 (507).

VI *For Annie*, lines 63-4 "A rosemary odor,
Commingled with pansies ———"

Prof K Campbell sees in this a reference to Ophelia's words, *Hamlet*, IV, v, 156 ff

(508).

(For all of the above page references, in parentheses, I am indebted to *Edgar Allan Poe, Representative Selections*, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, begun by Margaret Alterton and completed by Hardin Craig American Book Co N. Y. 1935).

⁷⁸We are not entering here into the controversy, indulged in by Rhodes, Patterson, Seylaz, Cambière, Valéry, on the extent to which Poe modified Baudelaire's ideas (Valéry calls Poe "le principal agent de la modification des idées et de l'art de Baudelaire", Patterson and Seylaz would agree with Valéry in this; but Quennell and Rhodes do not. (*Vide* Quennell, Peter, Baudelaire and the Symbolists London. 1929 p. XI, and Rhodes, II, 339, et passim) We are rather interested in discerning a common current of ideas, which is particularly interesting and important for the history of aesthetic and poetic thought.

⁷⁹Poe, 336 (The Phil of Comp.)

⁸⁰Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 669 (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu)

⁸¹*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, i, 4f.

⁸²Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du Mal, Bénédiction* (in Spleen et Idéal series)

⁸³*Ibid.*

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, *L'Albatros* (in Spleen et Idéal series)

⁸⁵Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 468

⁸⁶According to M. Ferran (265), the whole hymn to Imagination sung by Baudelaire is but a corollary of thoughts, expressed by Delacroix in his *Journal*. "Elle est la première qualité de l'artiste." Then Delacroix talks of "Ces sources obscures de nos plus sublimes émotions, et dont nous recevons ces chocs mystérieux que notre âme, dégagée en quelque sorte des liens terrestres et retirée dans ce qu'elle a de plus immatériel, reçoit sans presque en avoir la conscience." Delacroix, *Journal* III, 44, 25, Jan., 1857. In essence, what Delacroix—a great admirer of Shakspeare—has to say, is compactly expressed in the MSND passage on the Poet.

⁸⁷Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 225, 227, 521.

⁸⁸T. De Quincey, 'On The Knocking at the Gate' *Miscellaneous Essays*, 1854, from *The London Magazine*, Oct., 1823. Reprinted in *The Art of Conversation*, 1863. Baudelaire probably read this essay sometime during 1839-44, the period during which, Prof. Clapton conjectures, he read the first edition (1822) of *The Confessions of an Opium Eater* (See G. T. Clapton, *Baudelaire et DeQuincey*, Oct., 1931, p. 12).

⁸⁹"Les périodes éloquentes de De Quincey sur la douleur ont dû faire sur le jeune Baudelaire une impression profonde." "Si Baudelaire a lu De Quincey . . . avant 1845, il a dû dès ce moment absorber certaines idées que l'on attribue en général à Poe ou à de Maistre." G. T. C., p. 121.

⁹⁰*King John*, III, iv, 93f.

⁹¹Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, (Salon de 1846), 100-101

⁹²*Ibid.* (Also note 24, p. 746).

⁹³He also quoted from Stendhal the idea emphasized by DeVigny, that all of society is arraigned against 'l'homme supérieur', the poet. Thinking of that society as so many voracious beasts Baudelaire once wrote: "Ne cherchez plus mon coeur les bêtes l'ont mangé." See Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 321).

⁹⁴Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 642 (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu).

⁹⁵Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 786 (Note 2). Suggested title of Poe: 'Heart laid Bare'

⁹⁶*Fleurs du Mal, Spleen et Idéal* Series.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, *Tableaux Parisiens* series.

⁹⁸Max I. Baym, "Recurrent Poetic Theme," *SAB*, Vol. XII, No. 3, July, 1937, 155-158.

WILLIAM SHAKSPERE, BOTANIST

By PHYLLIS COOK

I. INTRODUCTION

THE plants that Shakspeare named in his plays and his method of using them have long been favorite subjects for amateur botanists to investigate. The field is a rich one, surprising in its variety and significance. It is often tempting to read into Shakspeare's words more than is really there, but it is just as easy to miss some of his less obvious allusions. As a botanist interested in the plays, I have tried to find out from them how much Shakspeare knew about plants and their habits and to some extent how he made use of this knowledge in his work. Many difficulties have presented themselves. Chief among them is the matter of nomenclature; for then as now, certain plants were known by one set of names in one locality, and by another set somewhere else, as today the cuckoo-pint of Sussex is the Jack-in-the-pulpit of Pennsylvania; or the same name might have been applied to one plant in one place and to an entirely different plant in another. "Cowslip" to an Englishman means a low-growing, furry-stemmed, yellow flower, while to a Pennsylvanian, the same name means the taller, smooth-stemmed, blue Virginia cowslip with its tinge of pink. In studying Shakspeare's plants, I have tried to identify them with present English flora, and secondly, with that described by other Shaksperian students; and at the end of my paper I shall list Shakspeare's name for the plant with what seems to be its modern scientific name, along with a number of the lines of its occurrence in the plays. I shall also try to point out the rôle that plants play in Shakspeare's work.

II. THE VARIETY OF PLANTS

The plays mention a great variety of plants, ranging all the way from the green scum on the pond to the majestic English oaks. I am sure that Shakspeare did not know the green scum that forms on standing water as "algae," because it is doubtful whether the word was yet introduced for that use; it is a word of Greek origin first used to describe seaweeds, the largest of an enormous group of lowly,

little-known plants Shakspeare may not even have realized that the green scum was living, but he had observed it, for he mentions it in at least three different connections. In *The Tempest*, Ariel leads the three drunken servants into "the filthy-mantled pool" and leaves them wallowing there; in *King Lear* Edgar characterizes himself as the homeless fool "who drinks the green scum of the standing pond"; and in the *Merchant of Venice* Gratiano speaks of a kind of men "whose visages do cream and mantle like a standing pond." It is amazing to me how remarkably suggestive of the slimy, foul-smelling scum the words, cream, filthy, and mantle are

The use of the fungi indicates that Shakspeare considered them imbued with a mysterious sort of life. Edgar, in *King Lear*, thinks he sees the fiend that mildews the white wheat, and Prospero calls on the beings that draw fairy rings,—"green sour ringlets" with their "midnight mushrooms"—which are so common on the damp English hills where the sheep pasture. Whenever anything about mushrooms is said, their existence is attributed to magic, which was the usual way of accounting for their sudden, overnight appearance.

Moss is a fairly common word in the plays, but it is never described very fully, and it is likely that most of the allusions really refer to lichens. There is one use of moss in *Cymbeline*, which I think refers to true moss. One of the princes swears to cover Imogen's grave with "furr'd moss" when summer flowers are gone. But most other references are to lichens. The living oaks "whose boughs were mossed with age" provide a favorable place for foliose lichens to grow, and in England's damp, warm climate, these plants grow comparatively large and green and become more or less moss-like. As far as I can find, Shakspeare made only one allusion to ferns, and that an inaccurate one in which seeds are attributed to ferns. Gadshill, in *I Henry IV*, says he, has fern-seed in his possession and therefore walks invisible. His so-called "seed" were really spores from which form in brown masses on the backs of common fern-fonds. They differ from seeds in that they contain no embryo plant like the parent. They are extremely minute, and Gadshill's

assertion concurs with an old idea. Once it was thought that plants had magic properties, and that the magic effect had some connection with the nature of the plant; for instance, the liver-shaped leaves of the *Hepatica* were considered good for liver ailments; similarly fern-spores so minute that they could not be seen except in great numbers would naturally tend to make one invisible.

References to true seed-bearing plants are very frequent and varied. I am rather surprised that there are only four evergreens,—the “upright” cedar, the “proud-topped” pine, the “sad” cypress, and the “dismal” yew. The cedar was, in all likelihood, the cedar of Lebanon, so greatly revered abroad and brought to England by travelers. It is not easy to say what pines are meant. They are characterized as “mountain” pines wagging their tops in the wind. Possibly it was the so-called Scotch pine that Shakspeare knew best. The cypress and the yew were almost surely the common trees still closely associated with graveyards. Broad-leaved trees are such an intimate part of the English countryside that it is quite fitting that they often form part of the natural background for scenes in the plays. Many of them are specifically named. The oaks, as one would expect, are most frequently alluded to. Very often large old oaks made convenient trysting-places. Other trees were evidently not just “trees” to Shakspeare, for he has qualified them with good specific names and differences—for instance, “the barky fingers of the elm,” “the cool shade of the sycamore,” “the willow aslant a brook,” “a tuft of olives,” “sharp hawthorn,” holly, box, “the threatening twigs of birch,” bay, “grained ash,” lime or linden, “shaking like an aspen leaf,” and Julius Caesar’s palm.

Many fruit trees have found a congenial home in England for a long time, and the people in Shakspeare’s plays speak familiarly of apples “rotten at the heart,” dangling “apricocks,” cherries, figs, peaches, “French” pears, plums, mulberries, quinces, medlars, “rotten ripe,” and “clustering bunches” of grapes. They knew too the fruit of the orange and the lemon. Orange and lemon trees had been introduced into England by 1595, and so it is possible that Shakspeare and his audience knew not only the fruit but also the trees. Juliet’s nurse asked for dates for the pastry, and the night-

ingale sang in the pomegranate tree in the Capulet's orchard, but it is improbable that the English knew these trees except by hearsay. Filberts and almonds are mentioned and so are the shells of walnuts; and so it seems to me that but few of the present common English fruits and nuts are omitted.

Shakspere uses the word "vine" often, but it usually refers only to the cultivated grape. A few other vines, "usurping" ivy, brambles, "luscious" woodbine, and honeysuckle, which may mean the same plant, twine about stronger plants and very often are used symbolically. "He was the ivy that hid my princely trunk," says Prospero of his brother. Non-vining shrubs are common in the plays. Groves of broom, sweet-smelling leaves of eglantine or sweet-briar, "stinking" elder, rosemary, and rue are all common experiences of the English, and as such they are included naturally. Among other dry things that shipwrecked Gonzalo longs for is the brown furze which clothes the slopes of the English Downs. Mistletoe grows as a partial parasite on oak and apple trees in England, and Shakspere characterizes it as "baleful." The clown of *The Winter's Tale*, preparing for the sheep-shearing feast, finds he must have spices—mace and nutmeg, among others. Mace and nutmeg are produced by the same plant, a small tree native to Asia and Madagascar. The nutmeg is the kernel of the fruit, mace the dried and ground fleshy covering. These spices had been for a long time important items of trade.

Low, non-woody plants, as one would expect, are present in the plays in the greatest profusion and variety. They are the plants which are most intimately concerned with every phase of daily life and the ones that we cannot help but see. Shakspere was no systematic botanist in his use of them, and so they fall most easily into five rough and by-no-means botanical groups—(1) the grasses, sedges, and grains, (2) the vegetables and spices, (3) the poisonous and medicinal herbs, (4) the melancholy and repulsive herbs, and (5) the pleasant herbs. Grass is frequently used as a general term for any low-jointed-stemmed, narrow-leaved plant, and no matter where the scene of the play is laid, we know that it is green, well-nourished English grass that is in the poet's mind. Even on Prospero's isolated island, Gonzalo cries,

"How lush and lusty the grass looks!" Rushes and sedges usually connote weakness; and Rosalind likens love to "a cage of rushes." The grains of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice were important food crops then as now, but contrary to present conditions, good times were associated with their abundance. Peas and vetches were grown for food for man and beast. All the foregoing, with the exception of rice, were produced in great plenty for the betrothal of Miranda and Ferdinand.

Many of our present vegetables, or at least types from which ours have been developed, must have been well-known in Shakspeare's time, for his people speak familiarly about peas, beans, cabbage, squash, garlic, onions, leeks, and radishes. Falstaff's host reckons that he has known Falstaff "twenty-nine years come peascod-time," just as to-day in rural England birthdays are remembered by pea-picking or 'tater-digging time. It is interesting, too, that Falstaff exclaims, "Let the sky rain potatoes!" so soon after their introduction into England. Caliban proposes to dig pignut tubers for his wondrous new master, Trinculo. Besides mace and nutmeg, the clown of *The Winter's Tale* wants "saffron to colour the warden pies, a race or two of ginger." Ginger is the dried root-stock of a perennial, creeping herb of the East Indies, and saffron is a bright yellow spice made from the dried stigmas of the common yellow crocus.

Shakspeare knew something of the poisonous and medicinal properties of many plants, for in that sense he used aconite, senna, rhubarb, and hemlock; and his Iago, that prince of devils, measured the effect of his evil upon Othello as being stronger than the powers of poppy and mandragora. My next group—the melancholy and repulsive herbs—might be confused with the preceding except that it seems to me that those have a definite effect upon the physical system, while the latter exercise a subtler effect upon the emotions. Among these are the flowers that Ophelia gathered—nettles, daisies, crow-flowers, and long purples or dead men's fingers which are, in more specific (though less expressive) words, a kind of wild orchid; and the weeds with which the mad Lear crowned himself—fumitory, burdock, hemlock—not the evergreen tree but the Socrates hemlock,

an ally of the parsnip, nettle, and cuckoo-flowers; and other dismal plants like knot-grass, heather, docks, mallows, wormwood, and all the weeds that grow "in our sustaining corn." The pleasant herbs are pleasant to think of and pleasant to name—plants that breathe all the sweetness of English woods and fields and gardens in spring—primrose, cowslip, harebell and violet; daffodil and narcissus; plants that breathe the warmth of summer,—pansy, thyme, mint, marjoram, crown imperial, lily, flower-de-luce, clover, lady-smock, strawberry, columbine, and rose; plants like carnations and gilly-flowers which represent man's skill with plant breeding, a practice with which Perdita, at least, is not in sympathy.

Such a variety of the plants, ranging from algae and fungi, over mosses and ferns, grasses and sedges, to fruit-trees, oaks, and carnations, comprises a fair sampling of English flora, including native and also naturalized members. And all are plants as well-known to present day Englishmen as they were to Shakspeare's audience and form an intimate part of their daily lives.

III. THE COLOR AND PERFUME OF PLANTS

Shakspeare does not mention many colors; those he does use are individual and definite. This characteristic of his may not be a virtue, but, at any rate, the adverse criticism that I often hear applied to nature-lovers cannot be applied to him; often friends of mine say that naturalists bore them by using hybrid colors like blue-green and reddish-orange to describe the plants of their delight, but Shakspeare resorts to no such device. To him, young wheat was green, ripe wheat was white, and cowslips were gold. He wrote of purple grapes, green figs, brown furze, green holly, and crimson roses; consequently, it might be said that the colors of the plants are not accurately described, but it seems to me that the adjectives he chose are far more suggestive than any awkward, manufactured terms could be. Shakspeare, like most people of his time, evidently was more aware of plant fragrance than we are, probably because he was also aware of more disagreeable odors than we are today. At any rate, passages in the plays indicate keen discrimination among odors. "Stinking elder" may not be a pleasant phrase,

but to many people it is accurate; but we find also "faint primroses," "sweet honeysuckle," and "hot lavender." In Laertes' prayer for Ophelia is borne the idea that the pure human body is resolved to earth which brings forth fragrant life again.

'And from her fair and unpolluted flesh
May violets spring;"

And certainly no words ever conveyed the perfume of violets as truly as do those of the Duke in *Twelfth Night*, when in tribute to the music, he sings,

"O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet sough
That breathes upon a bank of violets,
Stealing and giving odor."

So that though the English language may lack specific words that describe fragrance, Shakspere's choice of adjectives and associations is remarkably suggestive of many of the most subtle and delicate.

IV. INDIVIDUAL PLANTS AND PLANT SOCIOLOGY

Shakspere recognized specific form and habit in plants. Earlier I have said that specific differences among trees were apparent to him, because from his brief characterization, it is often possible to say to what particular species he was referring. This knowledge was not confined to large and superficial differences. At night the dew decked with liquid pearl the "bladed" grass; filberts "cluster;" Moss is "furred;" willow-leaves are "hoary;" violets "nod" on their stalks; the twigs of elm are ringed with bark; acorns are cupped; knot-grass grows in a tangled, "hindering" mat, and the cowslip's flower is a "bell." Helena's simile,

"Like to a double cherry,
Two lovely berries moulded on one stem,"

describes in poetic language a common anomaly in nature. Often Prospero refers to the "knotty entrails of the oak," a phrase perhaps more expressive of the complicated internal structure of an oak than "bast, and rays, and wood fibres" could ever be.

To a certain degree, Shakspere was conscious of the arrangement of plants in relation to other plants and to other

factors of their environment. "The turfy mountain" well describes low, rolling English hills with their covering of sod. "The rank of osiers" and "primrose-beds" express the habits of one kind growing in a community. English elms truly support luxuriant ivy, and Ariel leads his drunken trio through a good natured succession when he takes them through a thicket of briars and thorns into the algae-mantled pool where he leaves them wallowing in the slime. Shakspeare's individual plants are not free from troubles; they have storms and diseases with which to contend. "Through the sharp hawthorn blows the cold wind," "scalding winds rive the knotty oaks," and "the canker galls the infants of the spring." Sometimes, I think the poet's imagination ran away with him, for instance, when we come upon,

"A bank where the wild thyme blows,
Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows,
Quite over-canopied with luscious woodbine,
With sweet muskroses and with eglantine "

Such a bank is a little too luscious to be probable, but of course, it was located in fairyland, where we are not surprised at anything.

V. PLANTS AND THE MOODS OF THE PLAYS

To a certain extent the moods of some of the plays are set by the kinds of plants that are part of them. The titles of the plays are sometimes misleading, for *The Winter's Tale* illustrates the use of midsummer flowers and spring-blooming flowers. In the first three acts, no flowers at all are found; it is a dark time—a time of suspicion, accusation, death, and remorse; and then Autolycus, the rogue, closes the door on winter and calls forth the sunshine with his song,

"When daffodils begin to peer—"

Then in the shepherd's cottage, the guests assemble for the sheep-shearing feast, and Perdita distributes her warm, summer flowers—lavender, mint, marjoram, and marigolds—to the aging king and Camillo, but only the sweetest flowers of spring are fit for Florizel, her lover, and she longs for

"daffodils
That come before the summer dares, and take

The winds of Mach with beauty, violets dim,
But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
Or Cytherea's breath, pale primroses,
That die unmarr'd;

bold oxlips and
The Crown imperial; lilies of all kinds,
The flower-de-luce being one."

There is only that one short passage, but it catches the love of Perdita and the prince and pervades the play to its end.

The night of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* is warm and dewy and luscious, fragrant with the scent of summer flowers and lush with mature summer vegetation. Grass is thick and succulent, fruit heavy and ripe, and vines entangle the forest trees. It is not hard to see "the fountain clear," "the spangled starlight sheen," and "the bank where the wild thyme blows."

In *The Tempest*, the love of Miranda and Ferdinand shines as brightly as does that of Miridita and Florizel; but, for all that, it is Prospero's play, the riches of his life gathered together at harvest-time. The mood of the play is autumnal throughout; in fact, the first three acts are almost gloomily so. Weary Gonzalo longs for furze browned by the summer's sun, knotted oaks shade the island, and the season's growth of thorns and briars forms thick tangles around the bogs. But after Ferdinand has proven himself worthy of Miranda's love, when all of the bad people have been properly punished, and all of the good people are properly rewarded, when all are at last in their proper levels, then all of the goddesses and nymphs of the harvest appear and turn everything to shining gold and purple. Ceres offers all her grain—wheat, rye, barley, and oats, all warm and golden; purple grapes and all ripe fruits; and the sun-burned sickle-men and maidens dance in their rye-straw hats for the lovers. Ariel gets his freedom and after summer will fly on the bat's back until another spring hangs blossoms from the bough.

The mood of *Hamlet* is too somber to be one-seasonal; it is year-'round, and characterized by somber plants. Hamlet's world is bitter, all "wormwood, wormwood." His mind associates all he sees with nature's troubles—his uncle is

like "the mildewed ear," and he talks to Polonius about old men "with eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum." Even Laertes knows that "the canker galls the infants of spring." Ophelia, sweet and springlike as she is, garlands herself with gloomy weeds—crowflowers, nettles, daisies, long purples or dead-men's fingers, and drowns in a pool aslant which mournful willows hang. The whole mood of the play is somber.

In almost all of the plays, some such use of plants may be found, and usually the plants chosen and the choice of descriptive words or names are extremely successful in setting a mood.

VI. CONCLUSION

It certainly would be stretching a point to attribute to Shakspeare any systematic knowledge of plant life. He knew an amazing variety of plants, both native and exotic, by name; and he knew their colors, forms, fragrances, and times of blooming remarkably well. He was sensitive and humanly sympathetic with the differences in the life of different plants, so that he was what we should call today a naturalist in a sense, but by no means a biologist. He learned what he knew direct from outdoor observation and not from books. In his plays he never used plants for their own sakes, or for an exhibition of his knowledge. He saw them as an integral part of his world, and that is their place in the plays. We find them there as we know them, described without apparent effort and often with extraordinary accuracy.

| <i>Common Name</i> | <i>Scientific Name</i> | <i>Reference</i> | <i>Act</i> | <i>Scene</i> | <i>Line</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Aconite.. . . . | Aconitum sp.? | II Henry IV | ..iv | 4 | 48 |
| Almond.. . | Prunus Amygdalus | Troilus & Cressida | v | 2 | 194 |
| Apple | Pyrus malus | The Tempest | ..ii | 1 | 91 |
| | | The Merchant of Venice . | i | 3 | 102 |
| | | The Taming of the Shrew | iv | 2 | 101 |
| | | The Taming of the Shrew | i | 1 | 139 |
| | | Twelfth Night . | v | 1 | 230 |
| | | Twelfth Night . | i | 5 | 167 |
| | | Henry V . | iii | 7 | 155 |
| | | Henry VIII . | v | 4 | 64 |
| | | King Lear . . | i | 5 | 16 |

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Reference | Act | Scene | Line |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-----|-------|------|
| Apricot | Prunus Armeniaca | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iii | 1 | 169 |
| | | <i>King Richard II</i> | iii | 4 | 29 |
| Arabian Gum Tree | Acacia senegal | <i>Othello</i> | v | 2 | 350 |
| Ash | Fraxinus excelsior | <i>Coriolanus</i> | iv | 5 | 114 |
| Aspen | Populus tremula | <i>II Henry IV</i> | ii | 4 | 117 |
| | | <i>Titus Andronicus</i> | ii | 4 | 45 |
| Bay | Laurus nobilis | <i>Richard II</i> | ii | 4 | 8 |
| Barley | Hordeum vulgare | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 61 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | iii | 5 | 19 |
| Beans | Vicia Faba | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 1 | 9 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 45 |
| Birch | Betula alba | <i>Measure for Measure</i> | i | 3 | 24 |
| Box | Buxus sempervirens | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | ii | 5 | 18 |
| Bramble | Rubus fruticosus and Rubus caesius | <i>As You Like It</i> | iii | 2 | 380 |
| Broom | Cytisus scoparius | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 66 |
| Burdock | Arctium Lappa | <i>King Lear</i> | iv | 4 | 3 |
| Cabbage | Brassica oleracea | <i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i> | i | 1 | 124 |
| Carnation | Dianthus caryophyllus | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 82 |
| Cedar | Cedrus libanitica | <i>The Tempest</i> | v | 1 | 48 |
| | | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> | iv | 3 | 88 |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | v | 1 | 205 |
| | | <i>III Henry VI</i> | v | 2 | 11 |
| | | <i>Richard III</i> | i | 3 | 264 |
| | | <i>Henry VIII</i> | v | 5 | 54 |
| | | <i>Coriolanus</i> | v | 3 | 60 |
| | | <i>Titus Andronicus</i> | iv | 3 | 45 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | v | 4 | 141 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | v | 5 | 453 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | v | 5 | 457 |
| Cherry | Prunus Cerasus | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iii | 2 | 209 |
| | | <i>King John</i> | ii | 1 | 162 |
| | | <i>Henry VIII</i> | v | 1 | 169 |
| Clover | Trifolium sp ? | <i>Henry V</i> | v | 2 | 49 |
| Columbine | Aquilegia vulgaris | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> | v | 2 | 661 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 5 | 180 |
| Cowslip | Primula officinalis | <i>Cymbeline</i> | i | 5 | 83 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | v | 1 | 89 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 15 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 10 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | v | 2 | 49 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | ii | 2 | 39 |
| Crowflower | Caltha palustris | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 7 | 170 |
| Crown Imperial | Fritillaria imperialis | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 126 |
| Cuckoo-flower | Arisoema triphyllum or Cardamine pratensis | <i>King Lear</i> | iv | 4 | 3 |

| <i>Common Name</i> | <i>Scientific Name</i> | <i>Reference</i> | <i>Act</i> | <i>Scene</i> | <i>Line</i> |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Cypress | ..Cupressus sempervirens | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | ii | 4 | 53 |
| | | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | iii | 1 | 132 |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | iii | 2 | 323 |
| | | <i>Coriolanus</i> | i | 10 | 30 |
| Daffodil | Narcissus pseudo-narcissus | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 3 | 1 |
| | | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 118 |
| Daisy | .. Bellis perennis | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 7 | 170 |
| Date | ..Phoenix dactylifera | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 3 | 49 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | iv | 4 | 2 |
| Dock | .. Rumex sp ? | <i>The Tempest</i> | ii | 1 | 144 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | v | 1 | 52 |
| Eglantine | ..Rose rubiginosa | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 252 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | iv | 2 | 223 |
| Elder | ..Sambucus nigra | <i>Cymbeline</i> | iv | 2 | 60 |
| | | <i>Titus Andronicus</i> | ii | 3 | 272 |
| | | <i>Titus Andronicus</i> | ii | 3 | 277 |
| Elm | ..Ulmus campestris | <i>The Comedy of Errors</i> | ii | 2 | 176 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iv | 1 | 47 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> | ii | 4 | 358 |
| Fern | ? .. | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 1 | 96 |
| | | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 1 | 98 |
| Fig | Ficus Carica | <i>King John</i> | ii | 1 | 162 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iii | 1 | 170 |
| | | <i>Anthony & Cleopatra</i> | i | 2 | 32 |
| | | <i>Anthony & Cleopatra</i> | v | 2 | 235 |
| | | <i>Anthony & Cleopatra</i> | v | 2 | 342 |
| Flower-de-luce | Lilium or Iris spp. | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 127 |
| Fumitory .. | ..Fumaria media | <i>King Lear</i> | iv | 4 | 3 |
| Furze... | .. Ulex europaeus | <i>The Tempest</i> | i | 1 | 70 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 180 |
| Garlic | .. Allium sativum | <i>Measure for Measure</i> | iii | 2 | 195 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iv | 2 | 43 |
| | | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 162 |
| | | <i>I Henry IV</i> | iii | 1 | 162 |
| Gillyflower .. | Cheiranthus Cheiri or a variety of Dianthus caryophyllus | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 82 |
| Ginger | ..Zingiber officinale | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 3 | 48 |
| Grape | .. Vitis vinifera | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 112 |
| Grass .. | ..Family Gramineae | <i>The Tempest</i> | ii | 1 | 52 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | i | 1 | 211 |
| | | <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> | i | 1 | 18 |
| | | <i>King Richard II</i> | iii | 3 | 100 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | i | 1 | 165 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | iv | 2 | 50 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | | | |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | iii | 2 | 337 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | iii | 2 | 358 |

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Reference | Act | Scene | Line |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|------|
| Harebell .. | Campanula rotundi- folia .. | <i>Cymbeline</i> .. | iv | 2 | 222 |
| Hawthorn | Crataegus Oxyacantha | <i>As You Like It</i> .. | iii | 2 | 380 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> .. | iii | 4 | 47 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> .. | iii | 4 | 102 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | iii | 1 | 4 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | i | 1 | 185 |
| | | <i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> .. | iii | 3 | 77 |
| | | <i>III Henry VI</i> .. | ii | 5 | 42 |
| Heather ... | Calluna vulgaris .. | <i>The Tempest</i> ... | i | 1 | 70 |
| Hemlock . | Conium maculatum . | <i>Henry V</i> . | v | 2 | 45 |
| | | <i>Macbeth</i> .. | iv | 1 | 25 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> . | iv | 4 | 4 |
| Holly. . | Ilex Aquifolium. . | <i>As You Like It</i> . . | ii | 7 | 180 |
| | | <i>As You Like It</i> . | ii | 7 | 183 |
| Honeysuckle .. | Lonicera Pericly- menum .. | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | iv | 1 | 47 |
| | | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> .. | iii | 1 | 8 |
| Ivy .. | Hedera Helix .. | <i>The Tempest</i> | i | 2 | 88 |
| | | <i>Comedy of Errors</i> .. | ii | 2 | 180 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | iv | 1 | 46 |
| Knotgrass .. | Polygonum sp.? .. | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | iii | 2 | 329 |
| Ladysmock .. | Cardamine sp.? .. | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> .. | v | 2 | 905 |
| Lavender ... | Lavandula Spica . | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> .. | iv | 4 | 104 |
| Leek .. | Allium porrum .. | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | v | 1 | 342 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> .. | v | 1 | 342 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> . . . | v | 1 | 39 |
| Lemon . . | Citrus Medica Limonum | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> . . | v | 2 | 653 |
| Lily . . | Lilium sp? . | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> . | iv | 4 | 126 |
| | | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> . | v | 2 | 352 |
| Love-in-Idleness (Pansy) | Viola tricolor . | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> .. | ii | 1 | 168 |
| Mace | Myristica fragrans | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> .. | iv | 3 | 47 |
| Mallow | Malva sylvestris . | <i>The Tempest</i> .. | ii | 1 | 144 |
| Mandrake .. | Mandragora offi- cinarum . | <i>Othello</i> . . . | iii | 3 | 330 |
| | | <i>Antony & Cleopatra</i> .. | i | 5 | 4 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> .. | i | 2 | 17 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> .. | iii | 2 | 339 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> .. | iii | 2 | 310 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . | iv | 3 | 47 |
| Marigold | Calendula officinalis . | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> .. | iv | 4 | 104 |
| Marjoram | Origanum majorana . | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> . | iv | 4 | 104 |
| Medlar | Pyrus germanica . | <i>Measure for Measure</i> .. | iv | 3 | 184 |
| | | <i>As You Like It</i> . | iii | 2 | 125 |
| | | <i>Timon of Athens</i> . . | iv | 3 | 305 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . | ii | 1 | 34 |

| <i>Common Name</i> | <i>Scientific Name</i> | <i>Reference</i> | <i>Act</i> | <i>Scene</i> | <i>Line</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Mildew (Wheat) | Erysiphe graminis (probably) | King Lear | iii | 4 | 123 |
| | | Hamlet | iii | 4 | 64 |
| Mint | Mentha sp.? | The Winter's Tale | iv | 4 | 104 |
| Mistletoe | Viscum album | Titus Andronicus | ii | 3 | 95 |
| Moss | Class-Musci or probably Lichens | A Comedy of Errors | ii | 2 | 180 |
| | | Titus Andronicus | ii | 3 | 95 |
| | | I Henry IV | iii | 1 | 33 |
| | | As You Like It | iv | 3 | 103 |
| | | Timon of Athens | iv | 3 | 223 |
| | | Cymbeline | iv | 2 | 228 |
| Mulberry | Morus nigra | Midsummer-Night's Dream | iii | 1 | 170 |
| | | Midsummer-Night's Dream | v | 1 | 149 |
| | | Coriolanus | iii | 2 | 79 |
| Mushroom | Agaricus sp.? | Midsummer-Night's Dream | iii | 1 | 156 |
| Mustard (seed) | Sinapis alba | The Tempest | v | 1 | 39 |
| Narcissus | Narcissus sp.? | Two Noble Kinsmen | ii | 2 | 130 |
| Nettle | Urtica dioica | Hamlet | iv | 7 | 170 |
| Nutmeg | Myristica fragrans | The Winter's Tale | iv | 3 | 48 |
| Oak | Quercus Ilex of Robur | The Tempest | i | 2 | 294 |
| | | The Tempest | v | 1 | 45 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | iv | 4 | 31 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | iv | 4 | 40 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | iv | 4 | 42 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | iv | 6 | 19 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | v | 1 | 12 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | v | 3 | 15 |
| | | The Merry Wives of Windsor | v | 5 | 79 |
| | | Measure for Measure | ii | 2 | 116 |
| | | Much Ado About Nothing | ii | 1 | 247 |
| | | Love's Labor Lost | iv | 2 | 112 |
| | | Midsummer-Night's Dream | i | 2 | 113 |
| | | As You Like It | ii | 1 | 31 |
| | | As You Like It | iv | 3 | 105 |
| | | The Winter's Tale | ii | 3 | 90 |
| | | III Henry IV | ii | 1 | 55 |
| | | Troilus & Cressida | i | 3 | 50 |
| | | Coriolanus | i | 1 | 185 |
| | | Coriolanus | i | 3 | 16 |
| | | Coriolanus | ii | 2 | 102 |

| <i>Common Name</i> | <i>Scientific Name</i> | <i>Reference</i> | <i>Act</i> | <i>Scene</i> | <i>Line</i> |
|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | <i>Coriolanus</i> | v | 2 | 117 |
| | | <i>Coriolanus</i> | v | 3 | 153 |
| | | <i>Timon of Athens</i> | iv | 3 | 264 |
| | | <i>Timon of Athens</i> | iv | 3 | 422 |
| | | <i>Julius Caesar</i> | i | 3 | 6 |
| | | <i>Othello</i> | ii | 1 | 8 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | iv | 2 | 267 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> | iii | 2 | 5 |
| Oats | <i>Avena sativa</i> | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 61 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iv | 1 | 34 |
| | | <i>Taming of the Shrew</i> | iii | 2 | 207 |
| | | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 1 | 14 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> | v | 3 | 38 |
| Olive | <i>Olea europaea</i> | <i>As You Like It</i> | iii | 5 | 75 |
| | | <i>As You Like It</i> | iv | 3 | 78 |
| | | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | i | 5 | 226 |
| Onion. | <i>Allium Cepa</i> | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iv | 2 | 43 |
| | | <i>All's Well that Ends Well</i> | v | 3 | 321 |
| Orange. | <i>Citrus Aurantium</i> | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | ii | 1 | 305 |
| | | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | iv | 1 | 33 |
| Palm | <i>Phoenix dactylifera</i> | <i>Julius Caesar</i> | i | 2 | 131 |
| Peach. | <i>Prunus Persica</i> | <i>II Henry IV</i> | ii | 2 | 17 |
| Pear | <i>Pyrus communis</i> | <i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> | iv | 5 | 103 |
| | | <i>All's Well That Ends Well</i> | i | 1 | 175 |
| Pease | <i>Pisum sativum</i> | <i>II Henry IV</i> | ii | 4 | 413 |
| | | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 1 | 9 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 64 |
| Pignut | <i>Conopodium majus</i> | <i>The Tempest</i> | ii | 2 | 172 |
| Pine | <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> and other species | <i>The Tempest</i> | i | 2 | 277 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | i | 2 | 293 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | v | 1 | 48 |
| | | <i>Merchant of Venice</i> | iv | 1 | 75 |
| | | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | ii | 1 | 34 |
| | | <i>Richard II</i> | iii | 2 | 42 |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | ii | 3 | 45 |
| | | <i>Troilus & Cressida</i> | i | 3 | 8 |
| | | <i>Anthony & Cleopatra</i> | iv | 12 | 1 |
| | | <i>Anthony & Cleopatra</i> | iv | 12 | 23 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | iv | 2 | 175 |
| Plum | <i>Prunus communis</i> | <i>King John</i> | ii | 1 | 162 |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | ii | 1 | 101 |
| Pomegranate | <i>Punica Granatum</i> | <i>All's Well That Ends Well</i> | ii | 3 | 276 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | iii | 5 | 4 |
| Pond Scum | Class— <i>Algae</i> | <i>Merchant of Venice</i> | i | 1 | 92 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 183 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> | iii | 4 | 132 |

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Reference | Act | Scene | Line |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Poppy. | Papaver somniferum | <i>Othello</i> | iii | 3 | 330 |
| Potato. | Solanum tuberosum | <i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> | iv | 5 | 21 |
| Primrose . . . | Primula veris | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 122 |
| | | <i>II Henry VI</i> | iii | 2 | 63 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | i | 5 | 83 |
| | | <i>Cymbeline</i> | iv | 2 | 221 |
| Quince | Cydonia vulgaris | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | iv | 4 | 2 |
| Radish | Raphanus sativus | <i>I Henry IV</i> | ii | 4 | 206 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> | iii | 2 | 334 |
| Rhubarb..... | Rheum Rhaponticum | <i>Macbeth</i> | v | 3 | 55 |
| Rice | Oryza sativa | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 3 | 38 |
| Rose | Rosa sp ? | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 108 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 254 |
| Rosemary. . . | Rosmarinus officinalis | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 47 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | ii | 4 | 219 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | iv | 5 | 79 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 5 | 175 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> | ii | 3 | 16 |
| Rue | Ruta graveolens | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | iv | 4 | 74 |
| | | <i>King Richard II</i> | iii | 4 | 105 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 5 | 181 |
| Rushes | Juncus sp ? | <i>As You Like It</i> | iii | 2 | 389 |
| Rye | Lolium perenne | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 61 |
| | | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 136 |
| | | <i>As You Like It</i> | v | 3 | 23 |
| Saffron | Crocus sativus | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 3 | 46 |
| Sedge | Family—Cyperaceae | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | ii | 1 | 210 |
| | | <i>Taming of the Shrew</i> | Ind | 2 | 3, 55 |
| | | <i>I Henry IV</i> | i | 3 | 98 |
| Senna | Cassia acutifolia | <i>Macbeth</i> | v | 3 | 55 |
| Squash. | Cucurbita sp. ? | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iii | 1 | 191 |
| | | <i>The Winter's Tale</i> | i | 2 | 160 |
| Strawberry. | Fragaria sp. ? | <i>King Richard III</i> | iii | 4 | 34 |
| | | <i>Henry V</i> | i | 1 | 60 |
| Sycamore. | Acer pseudo-platanus | <i>Love's Labor Lost</i> | v | 2 | 89 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | i | 1 | 128 |
| | | <i>Othello</i> | iv | 3 | 41 |
| Thyme... .. | Thymus Serpyllum vulgaris | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 249 |
| | | <i>Othello</i> | i | 3 | 326 |
| Vetch | Vicia sp ? | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 61 |
| Violet..... | Viola sp. ? | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 250 |
| | | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | i | 1 | 6 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | v | 1 | 263 |
| Walnut | Juglans regia | <i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> | iv | 2 | 171 |
| | | <i>Taming of the Shrew</i> | iv | 3 | 66 |

| <i>Common Name</i> | <i>Scientific Name</i> | <i>Reference</i> | <i>Act</i> | <i>Scene</i> | <i>Line</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Wheat | <i>Triticum vulgare</i> ... | <i>The Tempest</i> | iv | 1 | 61 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | i | 1 | 185 |
| | | <i>Merchant of Venice</i> | i | 1 | 115 |
| | | <i>II Henry IV</i> | v | 1 | 16 |
| | | <i>Troilus & Cressida</i> | i | 1 | 15 |
| | | <i>King Lear</i> | iii | 4 | 123 |
| Willow | <i>Salix</i> sp.? | <i>Othello</i> | iv | 3 | 41 |
| | | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | ii | 1 | 194 |
| | | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | ii | 1 | 225 |
| | | <i>Hamlet</i> | iv | 7 | 167 |
| Woodbine | <i>Lonicera Periclymenum</i> | <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> | iii | 1 | 30 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | ii | 1 | 251 |
| | | <i>Midsummer-Night's Dream</i> | iv | 1 | 47 |
| Wormwood | <i>Artemisia campestris</i> | <i>Hamlet</i> | iii | 2 | 191 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | i | 3 | 26 |
| Yew | <i>Taxus baccata</i> . | <i>Twelfth Night</i> | ii | 4 | 56 |
| | | <i>Richard II</i> | iii | 2 | 117 |
| | | <i>Titus Andronicus</i> | ii | 3 | 107 |
| | | <i>Macbeth</i> ... | iv | 1 | 27 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> .. | v | 3 | 3 |
| | | <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . | v | 3 | 137 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dyer, T. F. Thiselton Folk Lore of Shakespeare Chapter VIII. Griffith and Farran London. 1883.
2. Ellacombe, H. N. Plant Lore and Garden Craft of Shakespeare
3. Singleton, Esther The Shakespeare Garden. Century Co. New York. 1922.

SHAKSPERE AND MUSIC

By MARIO CASTELNUOVO-TEDESCO

IF there exists one poet in all dramatic literature who "calls forth music," undoubtedly he is Shakspeare: the harmony of his verse, the musicality of his images, the astonishing variety of his expressions, have inspired and will always inspire musicians. He himself loved music, and understood it, and it would be interesting to list his numerous citations concerning instruments, musical theory (he even understood the Pythagorean theory of the "music of the spheres"), and his splendid and moving observations on music and its effects; but for lack of space, we must refer the reader to the work (thoroughly complete from this aspect) of Edward W. Naylor, *Shakespeare and Music*. Finally, what is most important, in almost every play, he himself asked for musical collaboration as a necessary element for completing the poetic expression; in general under the twofold guise of "songs" and instrumental commentary. Sometimes the "songs" are intimately linked with the dramatic expression, at other times they have rather the character of divertissement, or interpolation. Probably he was sometimes inspired by already existing "songs," perhaps he modeled his verses on well-known tunes; in any case several of these "songs" have come down to us with the music of the period, so-called "traditional." As for instrumental commentary, the directions in the text are more vague: fanfares, dances, at times some indications of instruments (flutes, oboes, lutes, viols, horns, trumpets). We know that Shakspeare had an orchestra in the Globe Theatre which underlined dramatic passages and played in the intermissions: a little orchestra composed of varied instruments, sometimes plaintive, more often boisterous, which must have resembled a "jazz band" more or less (and let none cry sacrilege! For very probably we would have to employ something like it today if we wanted to approach as nearly as possible Shakspeare's intentions . . .).

*

If, then, we want to follow the "musical lot of Shakspeare through the centuries," we must (before adventuring on

the subject of the many operas inspired by his plays) consider these two aspects (that of "song" and instrumental music) as the most "legitimate," those which he himself asked for, that he deemed essential.

The songs . . . : there are hundreds (if not thousands) of Shaksperian songs, stemming from all ages, and in all countries: from the "traditional" and from the old English Arne and Purcell (later we shall speak at greater length of Purcell and his operas), to the most modern. In a song from *As You Like It*, "It was a lover and his lass," we have famous examples from the Frenchman, Jean Philippe Rameau (1683-1764) up to the contemporary English composer, Vaughan Williams. Of these songs, some were destined for the theatre, some quite simply for concert; among the latter everyone knows the two famous *Lieder* of Schubert, *Who is Sylvia*, and *Hark, Hark, the Lark*, charming bits, even if detached from the original Shaksperian atmosphere. On the contrary, the *Five Songs of Ophelia*, little known and but recently published,¹ of Johannes Brahms, who composed them (in 1873, from the translation of Schlegel and Tieck) at the request of Joseph Lewinsky, were destined for the theatre, in fact for performances at the Vienna Burgtheater. And if, having passed the period of the German Lied, we reach the moderns, we shall find them (leaving aside the numerous English composers) in the Frenchmen, Chausson, Sauguet, Satie (with the astonishing title: (*Five Grimaces pour un songe d'une nuit d'été*—*Five Grimaces for a summer night's dream*), and even in Sibelius. Let me also observe that I, too, fervent admirer of Shakspeare, having studied the beauty and possibilities of his theatre for many years, composed (between 1921 and 1925) the entire cycle of thirty-three *Shakspeare's Songs*,² taken from the tragedies and comedies and set to music on the original text, the most complete attempt up to the present, I believe, in this genre by a single musician.

* *

Now let us turn to instrumental music. But here we must first dispose of a rather disturbing chapter . . . : was Beethoven really inspired by Shakspeare in most of his last Sonatas and Quartets? Arnold Schering believes so:³ starting with a remark by Schindler, contemporary and friend

of Beethoven, to whom Beethoven himself was supposed to have said, apropos of his Piano Sonata, op. 31, No. 2, that if he had read *The Tempest*, he would have found in it the "key to this Sonata," Schering not only plunged into the most audacious of suppositions, but into the most astonishing of analyses in imagining that Beethoven, in practically all his last instrumental compositions, had written music "with a key" (and consequently "with a program") passing in "review" the whole Shaksperian theatre (which he himself knew in the German translations of Schlegel and Tieck). Ingenious and perhaps attractive hypothesis, but absolutely gratuitous (leaving aside the unlikelihood of such a "mystery" shrouding to the present day the intimate source of a part of the most important Beethovenian creations). But, even having disposed of this problem, there remains a great deal more Shaksperian music to examine, and that in several instrumental forms.

In the 19th century, the tendency of musicians to idealize, romanticize, and amplify, brought them by preference to the Overture form, in which rather than follow step by step the unfolding of a play, they expressed their "personal impression" of the play itself. It is here that Mendelssohn gave us a masterpiece with his Overture to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, written at the age of 18 . . . : a model still unsurpassed for grace and fantasy. Another well-known example is that of Tschaikowsky; with *Romeo and Juliet* (and with another quite inferior Overture to *Hamlet*) he further enlarged the form and the frame, calling them *Overture-Fantasies*. But even more intolerant of form, Berlioz threw himself into the symphony, in *Romeo and Juliet*, or at least in what he calls a symphony . . . : strange "pastiche" with some parts sung and others recited, in which are found all the qualities and all the faults of Berlioz: from the inimitable grace and miraculous invention of *The Queen Mab* Scherzo to the insufferable vulgarity of "The Feast in the Capulet's House" . . . But I believe just the same that the Overture form can find marvelous sources of inspiration in the theatre of Shakspeare; and I have composed five: (*The Taming of the Shrew*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, *The Winter's Tale*), and I am thinking of continuing the cycle.

The symphonic poem has also rendered homage to Shakspeare with *Macbeth*, one of the first, but also one of the weakest, among the tone poems of Richard Strauss. But let us now examine the "incidental music," that is to say, the music truly destined to follow the performances, according to the intention of the poet—music which naturally differs greatly according to the tastes of the period and the occasions for which it was composed: from the ingeniousness of the primitive "adaptations" to the wider and more complex forms (as I said) of the romantic composers, and to the more daring conceptions of the moderns. There again Mendelssohn offered one of the most luminous examples with his music for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (written several years after the Overture) and some of these pieces (like the "Nocturne" and "Scherzo") remain models, even though bound to a conception more romantic than Shaksperian. But we would have to list a great many more examples: Humperdinck (*Winter's Tale*), Korngold (*Much Ado About Nothing*), Faure (with his music for *Shylock*, so beautiful an adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice*, written by the French poet, Alfred de Vigny), Debussy (with his *Music for King Lear*, incidentally of little significance and posthumously published), Florent Schmitt (*Anthony and Cleopatra*, written for the Andre Gide translation and for the performances of Ida Rubenstein in 1921), Auric (*As You Like It*), Pizzetti (again *As You Like It*: for the productions of the Florence May Festival in 1937), etc.

* * *

But now we must approach the problem of the collaboration of musicians with Shakspeare in a freer, more imposing, more subjective form (and, sometimes, even arbitrary) but important nevertheless: opera! It is quite natural that musicians found a host of "pretexts" which always "tempted," almost "haunted" them in the extraordinary richness of the Shaksperian theatre; but there also, the "fruit," the result, differs greatly with the tastes and the times (without even considering the personal talent of different composers).

By the middle of the 17th century, a name already presents and imposes itself, a name deservedly famous: Henry Purcell: a man of genius, "the good genius" of English

music . . . and, among his numerous operas, he wrote several under Shaksperian inspiration: *Timon of Athens*, *King Richard the Second* (1681), *The Fairy Queen* (taken from *Midsummer Night's Dream*; in 1692), and *The Tempest* (in the last year of his life, 1695.) However, if we still admire in him the sobriety of his "recitatives" (which stem both from Lulli and Carissimi), if we can still enjoy some of his very florid "arias" (where the words repeat themselves ad infinitum . . .) we especially appreciate qualities of "style," the first flowering of the baroque opera; it would be more difficult to find there the true expression of Shaksperian creatures . . . We must add besides that Purcell, although English, did not have recourse to the original text of Shakspeare (a fact which greatly diminishes his importance, but he employed the adaptations of librettists often unfortunate, as for instance, Shadwell, whom his contemporaries called "the assassin of Shakespeare!" And what assassinations were committed later by librettists (Italian and French) at the expense of Shakspeare! Strange: we might say that, by a procedure converse to that of Shakspeare, who often borrowed the subjects of his tragedies and comedies from foreign sources (particularly Italian "contes"), transforming and "sublimating" them, librettists reverted to the subjects of Shakspeare, and transformed them in their turn, but betraying and debasing them . . . One of the plays which has had the "worst fate," both as text and as music, has been *Romeo and Juliet*. Even Bellini, in his *Capuleti e Montecchi*, wrote one of his most mediocre operas; that of Gounod, played more often, is only a superficial French "comic opera" and the more recent one of Zandonai, bombastic and noisy, has nothing of the intimate and plaintive grace of the lovers of Verona. Let us leave to oblivion the almost ridiculous *Hamlet* of A. Thomas . . . *Othello*, on the contrary, had two great interpreters: Rossini and Verdi. It is said that Rossini remarked that what would survive of his music would be the entire *Barber of Seville*, the second act of *William Tell* and the third act of *Othello*; unfortunately, in spite of the undeniable beauties of this third act, the opera (based on an absurd libretto of Castil Blaze) has not survived. It is quite otherwise with Verdi . . .; but before speaking of *Othello*, we must mention *Macbeth*, which was his first Shaksperian attempt; composed to

a mediocre libretto by Piave, it is, in spite of good dramatic intentions, a dull and deficient opera, which has been revived recently in vain. Afterwards Verdi thought of *King Lear* for a long time, but after several efforts he gave it up. It was Boito who brought him back to Shakspeare, and Boito was an intelligent, cultivated man; but so imbued with German romanticism that quite often he wandered far from the true Shaksperian spirit, and, for example, transformed Iago into a sort of Goethian Mephisto. Nevertheless, because of the genius of Verdi, *Othello* is powerful lyric drama and attains a supreme beauty and an astonishing tragic expression, especially in the last act. However, other operas of Verdi contain a more vigorous vitality, and I think that Verdi, had he lived, would have gone farther in his dramatic conception. On the contrary, I cannot imagine that he would have been able to create something more accomplished than *Falstaff* in comedy: there is a perfect opera, miraculous in perfection and youth; it is still the most "modern" opera the Italian theatre has produced, and even if still not completely understood and appreciated by musicians and public, that is the road we must follow, if we still wish to compose musical comedies . . . Naturally, it leaves the modest *Merry Wives of Windsor* of Nicolai far behind, as I believe (although I am not acquainted with it) it also does *Sir John in Love*, on the same subject, of Vaughan Williams, who is, however, the first one who "dared" adopt, in part, the original Shaksperian text. Recently in Italy there has appeared a series of Shaksperian operas, *Romeo and Juliet* of Zandonai (which I already mentioned), *The Tempest* of Lattuada, *The Taming of the Shrew* of Persico (and that same comedy had inspired the Swiss composer, Goetz, in the past century), *King Lear* of Frazzi, *Julius Caesar* and *Anthony and Cleopatra* of Malipiero, but all more or less deficient: those of Malipiero are the most interesting, because of a certain sobriety which resembles, in a sense, Monteverdi, but they also lack a true vitality. In France Reynaldo Hahn recently composed a *Merchant of Venice*, which I do not know, but which I suppose is an amiable "comic opera" . . . But undoubtedly the most interesting of contemporary Shaksperian operas is *Macbeth* by Ernest Bloch; composed on a beautiful French adaptation by Edmond Fleg, this work has all the characteristics of the talent of its vigorous and profound

author. Presented for the first time in Paris in 1913, it was recently repeated in Italy with sensational success; I should like to see it played more often, I should like the American public to know it. . . .

* * + *

But is opera truly the ideal form to express the humanity, the fantasy, the poetic essence of Shakspeare, to realize the musical collaboration which the poet wished? That is the real problem (or, to say with Shakspeare: "that is the question"). Personally, I doubt it . . . ; in each case it is a problem which is bound up in another problem even more vast: that of "musicality and musicability of Shakespeare" and, though his "musicality" is universally recognized, his "musicability" is often argued. Pizzetti (the eminent Italian composer who was my teacher) made it the object of a very interesting study in his *Intermezzi Critici*⁵ and he arrived at some rather negative conclusions. But Pizzetti began with a rather unilateral point of view: that is to say that the "musical drama" was the only possible solution. From my point of view, on the contrary, the possibilities of solution are several and different. And above all, we must envisage the problem from two aspects: that of "language" and that of "form."

As for "language," I believe (and I have written so elsewhere) Shakspeare is absolutely untranslatable; he cannot be transposed into another language without breaking his poetic charm, without spoiling his miraculous harmony, without (often) betraying his spirit. On the other hand, his English is a perfectly musical language: I dare say (from my experience with it) that it unites the spiritual subtlety of English with the sonorous splendor of Italian. We must therefore approach him in English (and with the original text) and it is perhaps for the musician whose language is English to say the final word on the subject, to recapture and to complete the heritage left unfinished by Purcell.

As concerns "form," I see several possibilities, depending upon the different character of the plays, so prodigious is the versatility of Shakspeare. One possibility is, undoubtedly, opera, which means a completely musical and sung version.

But we shall have to renounce, above all, some of the "traditional conventions" of the melodrama: for example, that of grouping several different scenes into the same act. On the contrary, I believe that we would have to respect the division into "tableaux" which in Shakspeare combines such great effectiveness in contrasts (and which, moreover, for modern scenic means, no longer constitutes a difficulty), and I believe that a "musical drama in tableaux" (of the type of *Boris Godounoff*) would perhaps be the best way of solving tragedies like *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Lear*, and even *Hamlet*. The case is different for the comedies: evidently, one cannot always give "musical weight" to the entire text; and then the alternative of music and recitation (in the traditional sense of "incidental music") is still the preferable solution. I think, however, that we must avoid large modern orches-

tras, often too stuffed, and which have too much "weight;" I feel that a small orchestra, greatly varied in timbres, would better bring into relief the "piquancy" of the comedies, and at the same time would more closely approach the intentions of Shakspeare. As for the fairy scenes, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, I see another possibility, one which has not, as far as I know, been envisaged up to the present: that of the ballet; possibly a ballet with "songs" and choruses . . . One may object that suppressing the greatest part of the Shaksperian text in this way would also spoil its beauty. However, I believe that the association of music and dance would render better than any other means the poetic and musical essence of these fairy tales, their prodigious fantasy, their almost ethereal lightness, their almost symbolic and abstract worth . . . And what marvelous "rôles" I see for dancers in Oberon, Titania, and Puck; in Prospero, Miranda, Ariel and Caliban! . . . Finally, there is a fourth possibility, which could not have been imagined several years ago, and which perhaps embodies all (and which might in the future offer the best results): that of the cinema, of the association of "music and screen" (This is no blasphemy!). I know attempts have already been made, that there are two examples . . . which one should not follow! that of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (where nothing better could be done from the musical angle than to reproduce the music of Mendelssohn,

admirable in itself, but which does not "belong" from the cinematographic point of view), and *Romeo and Juliet* (where the Capulet ballroom would have been able to hold the entire city of Verona): both too "spectacular," and that is the danger we must guard against! On the contrary, I see in the "possibilities of synthesis" of the movies what could be the advantages of this form of art, and also in a more simple, more supple, more rapid musical commentary. I see *Macbeth* perfectly with a sombre tragic, obsessed music of the kind Honegger wrote for *Crime et Châtiment* ("Crime and Punishment"); or *As You Like It*, with music, detached, ironical and tender at the same time, of the type which Auric composed for *À nous la liberté*. But perhaps we are still quite far from this ideal, and we shall have to pass through several unhappy experiences before reaching it.

* * * * *

In any case, whatever the form adopted may be, Shakspeare's work, through its extraordinary vitality, its sparkling fantasy, its vibrant humanity, "calls forth" and will always call forth music! And (I wanted to say this at the beginning, but have left it to the end) we must not have too much historical preoccupation!" The work of Shakspeare is of such "an eternal quality" (how actually alive his dramas seem to us today!) that the musician can approach them without constraint, without mental reservation, in full confidence that present musical means lend themselves better than those of the past to express such a "sum total of beauty!" And the list of musical works inspired by Shakspeare will become (I hope for the future of art) longer and longer

Larchmont, New York.

¹Schirmer, New York.

²J. and W. Chester, London

³*Beethoven in Neuer Deutung*

⁴Ed. Ricordi. Milan

⁵*Intimezzi Critici* Vallecchi Florence, 1920

THE CONTINUITY OF SHAKSPERIAN PROSE

By HENRY W. WELLS

THE numerous discussions of Shakspeare's style have overlooked the curious discrepancy between the evolution of his verse and prose: while his art of verse passed through several well marked stages, his prose, highly varied at any period as it is, shows no comparable progression. When we say that Shakspeare's style develops, to be more exact we should usually say that his verse develops. His early prose is remarkable for maturity, his latest for relative similarity to what precedes it. There are, of course, some interesting transformations. But the evolution fails to strike deep and the great bulk of his prose gives a singularly unified impression. This article traces first the continuity and secondly the less striking lines of change.

Doubtless the reason that among many pages of description little or nothing has been written on the development of the prose is that there is comparatively small development. The contrast in this respect with the verse would, however, seem sufficiently notable to have attracted attention, while his evolution as a verse writer is by no means merely duplicated on a lower scale in the other medium.

Some of the causes for the undramatic story of Shaksperian prose lie close to the surface. One stabilizing factor lies in Shakspeare's so-called period of prose, the middle part of his career. Here computations are best made after excluding plays in which collaboration perplexes the issue. The undisputed plays may then be conveniently arranged in three groups: those from the earliest work to *The Merchant of Venice*, those from *Henry Fourth* plays to *Measure for Measure* and *Hamlet*, and those from *Othello* to *The Tempest*. The total number of lines in the first and third group are almost exactly equal; the number in the central group is half again as large. According to our familiar arrangement of the text, the first group has 3309 lines of prose or 14% of its total; the third 4628 lines or 19%, while the central group has 18,242 lines or 49%. In short, while Shakspeare's dramatic career covered at least

twenty years, within half a dozen years he wrote well over two-thirds of his total output of prose. These circumstances obviously help to give his prose a better center of gravity than his verse. While he wrote almost the same quantity of verse and prose in his central period, he wrote more verse in either his first and third period than in his second. To study his prose is thus to concentrate upon one period, while to study his verse demands an examination of two widely severed extremes of his career.

These conditions do not, of course, necessitate any stability in his use of prose. He might, indeed, have written still fewer lines of prose in his opening and closing years and still have followed in each a style radically different from that of the other and from the central period, which in turn even within the space of five or six years might show remarkable development. We shall find, however, good evidence showing that such was not the case, as well as the grounds for this conservatism. While, to begin with, it must be granted that some differences exist characterizing the three periods, it must finally be acknowledged that the differences are vastly less important than in the neighboring passages of verse. Anyone of literary taste coming for the first time to Shakspeare's plays could presumably place a quotation of a dozen lines of verse in one or another period of the dramatist's life, but it is extremely doubtful if he could do so in the case of prose.

Were we to attempt to describe in a word only such tendencies as distinguish the prose during the three stages, it would perhaps be admissible to call the first euphuistic,¹ the second poetic,² and the third baroque.³ But in accordance with what has already been said, it is likewise true that the euphuistic, or bookish style based on parallelisms, occasionally occurs in both Shakspeare's later periods,⁴ the baroque tendency, based on subtler elaborations, in both his earlier ones,⁵ and a poetic prose sporadically in all three.⁶ Thus the differences lie more in delicate shading than in sharply contrasting colors. Nothing approximating the evolution in the verse can be shown. Although often formal, the prose is remarkably free from mannerism or affectation. The verse is prismatic, the prose a white light.

Shakspeare was almost surely a greater master of verse

than of prose, giving to the former his best powers and the fruits of his fullest growth. In verse he carried his art farthest. It is at least indicative that besides his plays he left other works in verse and none in prose. In verse he wrote most of his scenes that rise to heights of climax. His tendency is also to give his major characters relatively more verse than his minor ones. The more poetic medium might be likened to the strings of his orchestra. And this emphasis upon verse accompanies an even greater concentration of ingenuity and creative imagination. One explanation of his supreme imagination as a verse writer is the older and richer tradition of verse. The medieval drama is wholly in rhyme, much of it distinctly creditable. Marlowe and his school, followed by Dekker, Chapman, Marston and others, were by 1600 writers of able verse, some of it brilliant. Although Lyly introduced an affected prose into comedy, no powerful prose except by Shakspeare was heard on the English stage until Ben Jonson. Shakspeare was thus a leader in the introduction of prose into English drama. He was far from a leader in the introduction of verse. The mere use of prose on a large scale was an innovation. It could hardly be expected that so young a medium in dramatic dialogue would as yet equal in force the long established one.

Yet Shakspeare was ambidextrous. He touched nothing without adorning it. He wrote prose only a little less readily or brilliantly than verse. Prose, it must always be remembered, is the sole medium for Falstaff, the principal medium for Rosalind and highly conspicuous in the parts of Mercutio, Shylock, Beatrice, Viola, Hamlet, the Duke in *Measure for Measure*, Pandarus, Iago and Lear. It is the principal medium in six comedies which, if not his greatest plays, were at least written at the very height of his powers. In supremely poetic passages it gives us Hamlet's praise of man and the universe, the most perfect of all expressions of Renaissance philosophy, as well as the heart of Falstaff's materialistic humor, the kernel of Iago's Machiavellian cynicism and most of the tragic mad-scenes. It embraces many of Shakspeare's most intellectual and most of his humorous lines. Moreover, without his highly conscious and perfected art of shifting between the two forms, his scenes must have lost much of their contrasts of light and shadow,

their energy and animation. These shifts keep the blood stirring and the thought brisk and alive. The very use of prose at all was innovating and audacious, its use beside verse singularly stimulating and its actual quality superb; but beside the verse it seems stylistically conservative. To conclude, the prose lacks the superb rhythms of the verse, the bolder achievements in usage, imagery and syntax.⁷ It is more distinguished for its realistic content than for its stylistic miracles. By the discovery of prose Shakspeare broadened his dramatic view of life but the wings of the poet always remained freer in verse.

Shakspeare's early prose stands, nevertheless, even closer to his greatest poetry than his early verse. His final art of verse developed out of many earlier phases, his prose was born virtually in full stature. It is remarkable how soon he achieved his philosophy of prose and how quickly he realized most of the possibilities within his reach as a prose poet. *Love's Labour's Lost* shows that he understood at an early date the use of prose for comedy,⁸ realism,⁹ local coloring,¹⁰ characterization,¹¹ epistles and proclamations which intrude parenthetically into the dialogue,¹² and wit of all sorts, especially sharp dramatic banter.¹³ Most of the verse in *Romeo and Juliet* is admitted to have a primitive and declamatory ring,¹⁴ quite foreign to Shakspeare's mature poetic style. But the prose of Mercutio and Juliet's Nurse has little by which to date it in the playwright's career.¹⁵ Again, the most celebrated lines by Shylock are the prose speeches,¹⁶ clearly more deeply poetic than the gorgeous verse-rhetoric of *The Merchant of Venice*.¹⁷ Finally, the poetic power of the Falstaff scenes¹⁸ is obviously more imaginative and highly developed than the declamatory verse neighboring it.¹⁹ There are, of course, a few trifling prose scenes in the early comedies, as in the Dromio episodes. But these are entirely competent farce. The prose of Launce is undeniably brilliant.²⁰ In short, while Shakspeare's earliest verse seems at times more reminiscent of Marlowe than prophetic of his own masterpieces, with only the most trivial exceptions his prose always appears mature. He began with a very moderate imitation of the wittier elements in Lyly,²¹ almost immediately achieved a high level of his own and never wrote in prose anything by half so audacious or stylistically experimental as the than his verse, though in the long run hardly less pleasing.

verse of *The Tempest*. Verse was his supreme field for literary experiment. Behind his conservatism in the treatment of prose appears a natural conviction that prose should be closer to colloquialism.²² One form invites the innovations of the poet, the other leans toward the commonly accepted usages of men; verse best represents the creative, prose the imitative aspects of his art.

To the last clowning and humorous characterization call forth a prose not essentially unlike that of the Launce or Bottom scenes. Autolycus, though he may put on a smooth and courtly disguise, is beneath his gay clothes still the jolly clown of early comedy, a flattering reminiscence, as it were, of Tarlton and Kemp in their glory. Thus his language shows no extraordinary change from that of his predecessors. Menenius's talk is but a shade less undignified than that of Juliet's Nurse. And conversely, Launce's dog has a serious aspect prelusive of the uncourtly dogs appearing from time to time in the prose of *King Lear*.²³ The prose scene between Iachimo and Posthumus in *Cymbeline*²⁴ may well be more deft and accomplished than anything which Shakspeare wrote when a less consummate master of his craft; and yet no one has written prose dialogue more economically and effectively than Shakspeare in the scene in *Henry Fourth* showing Falstaff feted in Shallow's garden.²⁵

Vast as is the range between comedy and tragedy, vulgarity and elegance, the absurd and the poetic in Shaksperian prose, he repeats effects more often in this medium than in verse. The princes in *Much Ado*²⁶ can be really as courtly as those in *The Winter's Tale*.²⁷ The art in caricature is much the same in Shallow and in Stephano. Prose signifies a breaking down of the walls of reason no less in the mad scenes of *Hamlet* than in *Macbeth* and *Lear*. Perhaps the prose style of which the poet tired soonest was the vaguely euphuistic repartee obviously intended to be more impromptu and lively than imaginative and profound, the manner reaching its climax in the banter between Benedick and Beatrice.²⁸ But if there are relatively few parallels to this voluble and lusty fooling in the later plays, few of the earlier ones are without them. It is safe to conclude that there is no major effect in his prose achieved only once or only in a single play. Thus his prose is less astonishing

The great scope and variety undeniably present in the prose may readily be discerned within a few plays written within a short period of his career or, indeed, within almost any one of his great plays, from *Hamlet* to *Antony and Cleopatra*. Where variety itself is so concentrated, we more readily consider Shakspeare as a prose poet endowed with an extraordinary richness than picture him passing through clear-cut metamorphoses as a stylist. His highest achievements as a prose poet are attained quite at random. His euphuistic manner reaches its climax in Falstaff's passages of mock eloquence,²⁹ his use of prose for caricature in Pandarus.³⁰ His use of it for grotesque effects rises to its heights in the mad-scenes and in the graveyard scene in *Hamlet*,³¹ his distinctly tragic prose in the sleep-walking scene in *Macbeth*,³² and his luscious imaginative prose in the Thersites passages of *Troilus and Cressida*³³ and the Egyptian scenes in *Antony and Cleopatra*.³⁴ In Shakspeare's youth Lyly's euphuism was in fashion; during his last years as playwright he addressed an increasingly courtly audience with new and subtler standards of elegance. For this audience the ever adaptable poet wrote the prose scenes between the gallants in *The Winter's Tale*.³⁵ The ground between the two extremes is not actually wide.

Shakspeare's one outstanding change is to use prose in more and more serious scenes, although the actual style often remains much the same in tragedy and comedy. In such early plays as *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, the romantic scenes are almost wholly verse, the farcical relief is prose. But the prose scenes steadily gain in weight. Not only the old-fashioned clowns, as Grumio, Costard and Speed, talk prose. Characters obviously of a mixed but more serious import, as Shylock, Benedick and Falstaff, use it. The account of Falstaff's death is in prose. In such rôles as Fluellen in *Henry the Fifth*, Shakspeare employs prose in the semi-serious spirit of the Jonsonian comedy of humours, with emphasis upon characterization and eccentricity. Prose is developed in the witty but lyrical love-scenes of *As You Like It* and in more romantic and poetic passages of *Twelfth Night*. The serious-minded and intellectual Duke in *Measure for Measure* employs it as a

feature of his disguise. Meanwhile a strange and wonderful blending of comedy and tragedy characterizes the prose speeches in such parts as Hamlet and Pandarus. Finally, prose at length wins its high place in purely tragic scenes of *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*. Especially in the last we see the evolution complete. Yet it will be noted that a few of the Edmund scenes, graceful and artful as they are, occupy secondary places beside the grandeur of the surrounding verse.³⁶ They are more courtly than tragic, more deft than poetic. In short, they suggest the last phase of Shakspeare's art, represented in the mildly baroque prose of *The Winter's Tale*.

Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

¹If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches, and poor men's cottages princes' palaces. It is a good divine that follows his own instructions. I can easier teach twenty what were good to be done than be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching. The brain may devise laws for the blood; but a hot temper leaps o'er a cold decree: such a hare is madness the youth, to skip o'er the meshes of good counsel the cupple (*M. of V.* 1, 2, 11.)

²What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me, nor, nor woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so. (*Ham.* II. 2, 3, 325.)

³Since their more mature dignities and royal necessities made separation of their society, their encounters, though not personal, have been royally attorneyed with interchange of gifts, letters, loving embassies, that they seemed to be together, though absent, shook hands, as over a vast, and embraced, as it were from the ends of opposed winds (*W. T.*, I, 1, 21)

⁴Harry, I do not only marvel where thou spendest thy time, but also how thou art accompanied, for though the camomile, the more it is trodden on the faster it grows, yet youth, the more it is wasted the sooner it wears. (*I. Hen.* IV, II, 4, 425)

Our bodies are gardens, to the which our wills are gardeners; so that if we will plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness or manured with industry, why, the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills (*Oth.* I, 3, 323)

⁵So it is, besieged with sable-coloured melancholy, I did commend the black-oppressing humour of the most wholesome physic of thy health-giving air; and, as I am a gentleman, betook myself to walk. (*L. L. L.*, I, 1, 233.)

Sir, his refinement suffers no perdition in you; though, I know, to divide him inventorially would dizzy the arithmetic of memory, and yet but yaw neither, in respect of his quick sail. But in the verity of extolment, I take him to be a soul of great article, and his infusion of such dearth and rareness, as, to make true dictation of him, his semblable is his mirror, and who else would trace him, his umbrage, nothing more (*Ham.*, V, 2, 113.)

⁶The curse never fell upon our nation till now; I never felt it till now: two thousand ducats in that; and other precious, precious jewels. I would my daughter were dead at my foot, and the jewels in her ear! would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in her coffin (*Mer. of V.*, III, 1, 86.)

I saw him run after a gilded butterfly; and when he caught it, he let it go again;

and after it again, and over and over he comes, and up again; caught it again, or whether his fall enraged him, or how 'twas, he did so set his teeth, and tear it, O, I warrant, how he mammoocked it! (*Cor.* I, 3, 63.)

⁷If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well!

It were done quickly if th' assassination
Would trammel up the consequence, and catch,
With his surcease, success, that but this blow
Might be the be-all and the end-all here,
But here, upon the bank and shoal of time,
We'd jump the life to come. But in these cases
We still have judgment here, that we but teach
Bloody instructions, which being taught return
To plague th' inventor; this even-handed justice
Commends th' ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips (*Mac.* I, 7, 1)

⁸The entire secondary plot is comic and largely in prose

⁹Local allusions are thickly strewn throughout the prose scenes

¹⁰Costard's reference to gingerbread is a pleasing example (*V.* I, 71.)

¹¹As in the delineation of Nathaniel in the opening of Act V

¹²The epistle by Don Adriano de Armado, read in *V.* 1, exemplifies this

¹³As in the banter between Moth and Armado. (*V.* I, 1-125)

¹⁴O woe! O woeful, woeful, woeful day!

Most lamentable day, most woeful day,

That ever, ever, I did yet behold!

O day! O day! O day! O hateful day!

Never was seen so black a day as this

O woeful day, O woeful day! (*R. and J.* IV, 5, 49.)

¹⁵No, 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church-door, but 'tis enough, 'twill serve: ask for me to-morrow, and you shall find me a grave man. I am peppered, I warrant, for this world. A plague o' both your houses! 'Zounds, a dog, a rat, a mouse, a cat, to scratch a man to death! a braggart, a rogue, a villain, that fights by the book of arithmetic! Why the devil came you between us? I was hurt under your arm. (*R. and J.*, III, 1, 97.)

An a' speak any thing against me, I'll take him down, an a' were lustier than he is, and twenty such Jacks; and if I cannot, I'll find those that shall. Scuvvy knave! I am none of his flint-gills, I am none of his skains-mates. — And thou must stand by too, and suffer every knave to use me at his pleasure? (*Ibid.*, II, 4, 153.)

¹⁶*Cf.* note 6.

¹⁷

Let none presume

To wear an undeserved dignity.

O, that estates, degrees and offices

Were not derived corruptly, and that clear honour

Were purchased by the merit of the wearer!

How many then should cover that stand bare!

How many be commanded that command!

How much low peasantry would than be glean'd

From the true seed of honour! and how much honour

Pick'd from the chaff and ruin of the times

To be new-vernish'd! (*Mer. of V.*, II, 9, 39)

¹⁸I do remember him at Clement's Inn like a man made after supper of a cheese-paring; when a' was naked, he was, for all the world, like a forked radish, with a head fantastically carved upon it with a knife. a' was so forlorn, that his dimensions to any thick sight were invisible. a' was the very genius of famine, yet lecherous as a monkey, and the whores called him mandrake. a' came ever in the rearward of the fashion, and sung those tunes to the over-scuthed huswives that he heard the carmen whistle, and sware they were his fancies or his good-nights. And now is this Vice's dagger become a squire, and talks as familiarly of John a Gaunt as if he had been sworn brother to him; and I'll be sworn a' ne'er saw him but once in the Tilt-yard; and then he burst his head for crowding among the marshal's men (*I Hen. IV.*, III, 2, 325.)

¹⁹You, lord Archbishop,

Whose see is by the civil peace maintain'd,

Whose beard the silver hand of peace hath touch'd,

Whose learning and good letters peace hath tutor'd,
 Whose white investments figure innocence,
 The dove and very blessed spirit of peace,
 Wherefore do you so ill translate yourself
 Out of the speech of peace that bears such grace,
 Into the harsh and boisterous tongue of war;
 Turning your books to graves, your ink to blood,
 Your pens to lances, and your tongue divine
 To a loud trumpet and a point of war? (*Ibid.*, IV, 1, 41)

²⁰T. G. of V., IV, 4, 1-43.

²¹Cf. note I.

²²Cf. Jonson's words in the famous prologue to *Every Man in His Humour* regarding "language such as men do use."

²³T. G. of V., IV, 4, 1-43, and *Lear*, I, 4, 115.

²⁴IV, 1.

²⁵*II Hen.* IV, V, 1.

²⁶*Don Pedro*: Good Signior Leonato, you are come to meet your trouble; the fashion of the world is to avoid cost, and you encounter it

Leonato: Never came trouble to my house in the likeness of your Grace for trouble being gone, comfort should remain; when you depart from me, sorrow abides, and happiness takes his leave.

Don Pedro: You embrace your charge too willingly. (*M. A. A. N.*, I, 1, 94)

²⁷*Camillo*: I think, this coming summer the King of Sicilia means to pay Bohemia the visitation which he justly owes him.

Archidamus: Wherein our entertainment shall shame us we will be justified in our loves, for indeed —

Camillo: Beseech you, —

Archidamus: Verily, I speak it in the freedom of my knowledge; we cannot with such magnificence — in so rare — I know not what to say. We will give you sleepy drinks, that your senses, unintelligent of our insufficiency, may, though they cannot praise us, as little accuse us. (*W. T.*, I, 1, 5.)

²⁸*M. A. A. N.*, I, 115-144, and many later scenes.

²⁹See note 4.

³⁰A whoreson tussick, a whoreson rascally usick, so troubles me, and the foolish fortune of this girl, and what one thing, what another, that I shall leave you one o' these days and I have a rheum in mine eyes too, and such an ache in my bones that, unless a man were cursed, I cannot tell what to think on't—What says she there? (*T. and C.*, V, 3, 101)

³¹That skull had a tongue in it, and could sing once, how the knave jowls it to the ground, as if it were Cain's jaw-bone that did the first murder! It might be the pate of a politician, which this ass now o'er-reaches, one that would circumvent God, might it not? (*Ham.* V, 1, 79)

³²Out, damned spot! out, I say! One two why, then 'tis time to do't Hell is murky Fie, my lord, fie! a soldier, and afeard? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account? Yet who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him? (*Mac.* V, 1, 36.)

³³O' the t'other side, the policy of those crafty swearing rascals, that stale old mouse-eaten dry cheese, Nestor, and that same dog-fox, Ulysses, is not proved worth a blackberry. They set me up in policy that mongrel cur, Ajax, against that god of as bad a kind, Achilles: and now is the cur Ajax prouder than the cur Achilles, and will not arm to-day, whereupon the Grecians begin to proclaim barbarism, and policy grows into an ill opinion. (*T. and C.*, V, 4, 7)

³⁴Her passions are made of nothing but the finest parts of pure love. we cannot call her winds and waters sighs and tears, they are greater storms and tempests than almanacs can report this cannot be cunning in her; if it be, she makes a shower of rain as well as Jove (*A and C.* I, 2, 148.)

³⁵*W. T.*, I, 1, and V, 2.

³⁶How malicious is my fortune, that I must repent to be just! This is the letter he spoke of, which approves him an intelligent party to the advantages of France O heavens! that his treason were not, or not I the detector (*Lear*, III, 5, 7.)

THE ROARING BOY IN TUDOR AND STUART LITERATURE

By BURTON MILLIGAN

ALTHOUGH roaring boys are frequently depicted in sixteenth and seventeenth-century literature, and although students of the period are familiar with them as a type, there are certain misconceptions about these bullies and roisterers which need correction. For instance, it is sometimes thought that they flourished only in Shakspeare's England. No less authority than the *New England Dictionary* defines roaring boys as "riotous fellows of the time of Elizabeth and James I";¹ but very little investigation is needed to show that they were numerous much earlier and much later than the designated period, as well as during it. Both literary and historical evidence shows that they were a familiar type from the early sixteenth century to the late seventeenth century. Another misconception has to do with the criminal and social status of roaring boys. Because in literature roaring boys are not infrequently depicted as petty thieves and swindlers masking their nefarious activities under pretensions to gallantry and fashion, some commentators have been misled, I believe, into assuming that thievery and the pretended character of a gentleman are as definitely typical of the roaring boys as roistering, bullying, and vandalism. For instance, Mr. Boughner, writing of "Pistol and the Roaring Boys," in a valuable article, seems to make this assumption, when he says that

Pistol's ups and downs form a slice-of-life picture of the roaring boy, who on his more respectable side is a follower of the fashions and a pretender to gentlemanly attributes, but on his seamier side is the petty thief and haunter of the tavern and brothel²

As I hope to demonstrate, the fact of the matter seems to be that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the term *roaring boy* was applied, rather indiscriminately, to two classes of persons: (1) boisterous young gentlemen, who often behaved in an ungentlemanly manner, quarreling in taverns, breaking windows of houses of prostitution, and bullying innocent pedestrians; and (2) petty swindlers, who imitated the "fashionable" excesses of such young bloods as cloak to more serious misdemeanors.

The following discussion attempts not only to present evidence corrective of the misconceptions which I have noted, but also to establish from literary and historical sources the conventionalized description and characteristic behavior of roaring boys.

Interesting as an early reference to roaring boys are Barclay's lines in *The Ship of Fools* (1509) :

Some other Folys range about by nyght
 Prowdeley Jettynge as men myndeles or wode
 To seke occasyon with pacyent men to fyght,
 Delytynge them in shedyng mennys blode
 Outher els in spoylynge of other mennys gode.
 Let these folys, with suche lyke and semblable
 Drawe to this barge, here shall they bere a bable.³

Significantly, Barclay stresses the fact that the bullies are "Folys" and "men myndeles or wode"; he does not, certainly, imply that they are either thieves or professional criminals.

Of later references that I have observed, the greater number indicate that the typical offences of roaring boys were quarrelsomeness in taverns and ordinaries, drunkenness, insolence to pedestrians and officers of the law, blasphemy, vandalism, and lechery. Drunkenness seems, indeed, to have been the cause of most of the other offences, if no adequate excuse for them. Edward Guilpin's *Skialetheia* (1598) makes this point clear in a thumbnail sketch of the behavior of roarers at ordinaries:

You goe a knot to Bloom his Ordinary,
 Friends and glad fellows all now; by and by
 Thei'le be by the eares, vie stabs, exchange disgraces,
 And bandie daggers at each other's faces.⁴

The same sort of quarrelsomeness at ordinaries, after drinking bouts, was common in the Restoration, as the following quotation from *The Nicker Nicked* (1669) shows; the writer emphasizes the good humor of the gallants on their arrival at the ordinary:

Then, before two hours are at an end, some one has been heated with wine or made cholerick with loss of his money, [he] raises a quarrel, swords are drawn, and perhaps the boxes and candlesticks thrown at one another; and all the house [is] in a garboil, forming a perfect type of hell.⁵

Sometimes, of course, these affrays amounted to more than bluster, and culminated in stabbings and murders. In Martin Parker's "The Libertine's Conversion" (c. 1628) a roaring boy sadly recalls the injury he received in a tavern brawl:

At pot and pipe I lost mine eye
In quarrell, most unluckily.⁶

On the streets, especially late at night after protracted carousals, these roisterers insulted or attacked solitary pedestrians, beat up watchmen, and broke windows. Of many descriptions of their vandalism on such occasions, none is more spirited and colorful than that in *The Character of a Town-Gallant* (1675):

And when they vouchsafe to Ramble homewards about One or Two o'Clock in the morning, they set up the dreadful Sa! sa! more dangerous to meet than an Indian Running a Muck. In the Heroic humours hath many a Watchman had his Horns [*i.e.*, lanthorne] Battered about his Ears; and the trembling Constable been put besides the Gravity of his Interrogations, and forced to measure his Length upon the Ground. The first man they meet they swear to Kill, and set all the women on their Heads, and so they proceed till the rattling of Broken Glass Windows, the shrieks of distressed Damsels, and the Thunder of their own Oaths and Execrations, fills all the Neighbourhood with horror, and makes their verily conclude, that the Devil and all his Life Guards are going a Professioning.⁷

Even when their humours were less "Heroic," these rogues were annoying to pedestrians, particularly in crowding them off the walks.

If they be three to one they'le have the wall,

wrote Brathwaite,⁸ making an accusation reiterated by others. By all accounts, roaring boys did indeed drink so prodigiously that their behavoiir after drinking bouts was hardly remarkable. Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613) states that

they will drinke ye
From morne till night, from night till morne againe,
Emptying themselves like Conduits, and remaine
Ready for more still. Earth drinke not the showres
Faster than their infernall throats deuours
Wine and strong liquours.⁹

Their profanity likewise drew rebuke from more than one

satirist. Rowlands, for instance, writing "A Roaring Boyes Description" in *A Paire of Spy-Knaves* (c. 1620), said:

God's name is never in their mouthes, or heartts,
Unless by oaths, to teare him out in parts,
Blasphemously abusing his dread name,
And hating those that doe reprove the same¹⁰

The author of *The Nicker Nicked* (1669) took particular exception to this blasphemy, of which he gave some specific and amusing examples:

Blasphemy, drunkenness, and swearing are here [at an ordinary] so familiar, that civility is, by the rule of contrarieties, accounted a vice. I do not mean swearing, when there is occasion to attest a truth, but no occasion, as 'God damn me, how dost?' 'What a clock is it, by God?'¹¹

Similarly, the broadside ballad "The Cheating Age" (c. 1626), describing a roarer, mentions

The terrible oaths which for nothing he sware.¹²

The lechery of roaring boys was proverbial. According to Lodge, the "daily exercise" of one of these bullies was "to be champion in a bawdy house."¹³ In *Measure for Measure* Pompey, servant to the bawd Mistress Overdone, remarks that roaring boys are "all great doers in our trade."¹⁴ Wither branded them as "whores' champions",¹⁵ and Overbury called them supervisors to brothels.¹⁶ The roaring boy in Martin Parker's "The Libertine's Conversion" (c. 1628) confessed that at

Old-street end, though then a lad,
Foure wenches at one time I had¹⁷

The roarer in *The Wandering Jew Telling Fortunes to Englishmen* (1649) boasts:

Jew, I would have thee know I am a man of the sword; a Battoon Gallant, one of our Dammees, a bouncing boy, a kicker of bawds, a tyrant over punks . . .¹⁸

In a lesser number of literary references, the offences attributed to roaring boys indicate that some who went by the name were indeed swindlers, thieves, and bullies of the lowest class. "In Terme time," says Lodge, writing of Brawling Contention, "he is a Setter, to further horse-stealers; and to connycatch a countryman, he shall giue place to none in Newgate. . . ."¹⁹ Shave'em, the prostitute

in Massinger's *The City Madam* (1632), accuses Ramble and Scuffle, "two swaggering, suburban roarers, Sixpenny truckers," of cutting a purse in St. Paul's at a sermon and of stealing bacon from a poor market woman.²⁰ The roaring boy who confesses his sins in "The Town Bully's Bravery" (c. 1690), says:

A Pocket I can pick with the very best alive,

and adds:

Sometimes I am mounted upon dapple gray,
To take a Purse or so upon the King's Highway,
With a Pistol in my hand, and the word is D— Stand,
Likewise Deliver, then they quiver, yield to my demand.²¹

Pettier cheats, such as refuse to pay reckonings at taverns, are also mentioned by satirists. "The Town Bully's Bravery" gives a particularly unpleasant and, no doubt, realistic picture of the way these blustering bullies made tavern attendants cringe, and yet would "seldom pay at all."²² Some of the roarers, it also appears, were among the sharpers who gambled and cheated at cards and dice. Have-at-all, the roaring boy in Cartwright's *The Ordinary* (1634), says:

I do but think how I
Shall bastinado o'er the ordinaries.
Arm'd with my sword, battoon and foot, I'll walk
To give each rank its due. No one shall 'scape
But he I win of.²³

Yet another roguery of certain roaring boys of the more disreputable type was the making of deceptive and boastful claims about military service. The motives for such claims, one may surmise, were not only the desire of the bullies to appear brave and fearsome, but also their wish to take on a color of respectability and gentility—to play the part of swaggering young gentlemen. Fraudulent boasts of military service are held up to scorn in the broadside ballad "I Know What I know" (c. 1620):

There be many Rorers,
that swagger and rore
As though they in th' warres had been
seuen yeeres and more;
And yet they neuer lookt
in the face of a foe;
They seeme gallant sparkes,
but I know what I know.²⁴

The idea of the roaring boys as mere thugs, criminals, and professional bullies of the lowest sort is reinforced, it must be added, by many characterizations of them in plays—for instance, Kastril in Jonson's *The Alchemist*; Val Cutting in his *Bartholomew Fair*; Warbeck, in Ford, Dekker, and Rowley's *The Witch of Edmonton*; Matheo in Dekker's *The Honest Whore*, Part II; Ruffman in Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West*; Ramble and Scuffle in Massinger's *The City Madam*; Have-at-all and Slicer in Cartwright's *The Ordinary*; and Captain Hackum in Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia*. In such characterizations, it must be admitted, there is little suggestion of the young gentlemen or aristocrat who occasionally indulges in an evening of debauchery and riot. Perhaps they, especially, have tended to narrow the modern student's conception of the roaring boy.

When one seeks historical parallels to the literary references to roaring boys and their wild conduct, one finds a number of them. Such accounts as the following, by Luttrell, are not uncommon:

The 13th [of January, 1681/2], at night, some young gentlemen of the Temple went to the Kings Head tavern in Chancery lane, committing strange outrages there, breaking of windows, &c., which the watch hearing off [*sic*], came up to disperse them; but they sending for severall of the watermen with halberts that attend their comptroller at the revells, were engaged in a desperate riott, in which one of the watchmen was run through the body with an halbert, and lies very ill, but the watchmen secured one or two of the watermen.²⁵

That the offenders on this occasion were not professional criminals or thugs, but "young gentlemen of the Temple," is worth remarking. Similarly, the behavior of Wyatt and Surrey, in 1543, when they were arrested for smashing windows with a stonebow,²⁶ was undoubtedly that of many other young gallants who were not habitual criminals. Also resembling the affrays of roaring boys but not involving professional criminals were the tavern quarrel at Deptford, in 1593, in which Ingram Frizer murdered Marlowe; the duel, in 1598, in which Ben Jonson killed his fellow actor Gabriel Spencer; the street brawl in which Sir George Etherege and Rochester were involved at Epsom, in 1676, and in which one of their companions was killed. Evidence of this sort should, however, by no means militate against

the conclusion that there were many roaring boys who were habitual criminals. It is a well established fact that bullies of this type not only existed in great number, but that some of them became members of criminal fraternities like the Tityre-tues of the seventeenth century and the Mohocks of the early eighteenth century.²⁷

Champaign, Illinois.

¹Under boy, sb 6.

²D C. Boughner, "Pistol and the Roaring Boys," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* XI (1936), 227. Cf. p 237, the statement that Pistol "is clearly modeled after a common Elizabethan type, the roaring boy, whose characteristics he displays . . ."

³Ed Jameson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1874). I, 299 That Barclay was not in this passage merely translating from the German original, Brant's *Narrenschiff*, but that he was consciously describing English conditions, has been pointed out by Pompen, *The English Versions of 'The Ship of Fools'* (New York, 1925), pp 241-242 The lines that I have quoted occur in one of three stanzas marked "Additio translatoris Alexandri barclay" and replace lines in the original not appropriate to England According to Griffiths, *The Chronicles of Newgate*, 2 vols (London, 1884), I, 29, a man named Elmer de Multone was indicted as a "rorere" in 1311.

⁴*Skialetheia or a Shadow of Truth in certain Epigrams*, ed Grosart (Manchester, 1878), p. 60.

⁵*Harleian Miscellany*, VII, 362

⁶*Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. Chappell and Ebsworth, 9 vols. (London, 1871), III, 125 cf. in *Measure for Measure*, IV, iii, 13-15, the clown Pompey's reference, when he sees a group of roisterers in prison, to "Master Starve-lackey the rapier and dagger-man, and young Drop-heir that killed lusty Pudding"

⁷*The Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, ed. Hindley, 3 vols (London, 1873), II, 7-8. Cf. Captain Hackum's speech in Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688), I, 1 "We had fiddles, whores, scoured, broke windows, beat watches, and roared like thunder."

⁸*A Strappado for the Divell*, ed Ebsworth (Boston, Lincolnshire, 1878), p 52.

⁹*Juvenilia*, 2 vols. (Spenser Society, 1871), I, 243.

¹⁰*Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands*, 3 vols (Glasgow, 1880), II, 15

¹¹*Harleian Miscellany*, VII, 362.

¹²*A Pepysian Garland*, ed. Rollins (Cambridge University Press, 1922), p 245.

¹³*Complete Works*, 4 vols. (Hunterian Club, 1883), IV, 63

¹⁴IV, iii, 20

¹⁵*Juvenilia*, I, 243.

¹⁶*Miscellaneous Works*, ed. Rimbault (London, 1856), p 122.

¹⁷*Roxburghe Ballads*, III, 125

¹⁸*A Book of Characters*, ed. Aldington (New York, n d), p 383

¹⁹*Works*, IV, 63.

²⁰III, 1.

²¹*Pepys Ballads*, ed Rollins, 6 vols (Harvard University Press, 1929-1931), V, 285-286.

²²*Ibid.*, V, 285.

²³II, 1.

²⁴*Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 120 Cf. Brathwaite's statement in regard to roaring boys, *A Strappado for the Divell*, ed Ebsworth, p 52

Buffe-yerkins say their souldiers, (but's not so,)

For they were prest indeed but durst not goe.

²⁵*A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1857), I, 158

²⁶Bapst, *Deux Gentilshommes-Poetes* (Paris, 1891), pp. 267-268. On at least two other occasions they had created miniature riots, once by running amuck with their stonebow in the prostitute quarter of Southwark.

²⁷T S Graves, "Some Pre-Mohock Clansmen," *Studies in Philology*, XX (1923), 396.

A NOTE ON 2 HENRY IV

By RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

IN *A Collection of Poems . . . with Notes* (Dublin, 1792-4), Samuel Whyte (1733-1811) gives a source for *2 Henry IV*, V, 2, 112-117, that has hitherto escaped notice. Whyte was a Dublin pedagogue and litterateur who conducted for over fifty years a seminary for young ladies and young gentlemen at 75 Grarton Street.¹ His influence and ability as a teacher were attested by his pupil, Thomas Moore, who spoke of Whyte as "at the head of his profession in [Dublin] . . . [I owe] . . . to that exalted person all the instruction in English literature [I] have ever received."² No one ever praised Whyte's standing as a poet, nor is it likely that anyone ever will. But he liked to dabble in criticism, and among his critical observations is the one mentioned above. He remarks that Shakspeare "has him [Henry V], having ascended the throne of his deceased father, in a friendly expostulation with the man who had committed him, restoring him to office, with these remarkable words:

You did commit me:
For which I do commit into your hand
The unstain'd sword that you have used to bear;
With this remembrance,—*that you use the same*
With the like bold, just and impartial spirit
As you have done 'gainst me.

"The very idea of Ulpian Trajan, the 13th Roman Emperor, who, at his inauguration, when he delivered, according to custom, the sword to the chief of the Prætorium, added,

*Hoc pro me si juste imperatore, si perperam contra me utere*³

Although the parallel is not perfect, the similarity is sufficiently marked to give point to Whyte's comment. The ceremony of presenting the sword was in both cases symbolic; and it seems reasonable to believe that Shakspeare had Trajan's gesture and words in mind.

Whyte does not say where he found his quotation, and it is possible that he wrote from memory. He may have run across the story in any one of a number of places. The chief sources for it are Pliny the Younger, *Panegyricus*, 67; Victor, *De Caesaribus*, 13; and Dion Cassius, *History of*

Rome (Greek), 68. It is found also in Zonaras, *Compendium of History* (Greek), Bk II; Xiphilinus the Younger, *Epitome of Dion Cassius* (Greek); and Suidas, *Lexicon* (Greek). These were all available to Shakspeare; in the cases of Dion, Zonaras, Xiphilinus, and Suidas, in Latin translation from Greek. In no one of the sources mentioned are Whyte's exact words used; Xiphilinus is the closest: "*Hoc pro me utaris, si bene imperavero: sin secus, contra me.*"

Or he may have remembered the story from Milton, who makes use of it three times; and Milton, among the English poets, was Whyte's idol.²⁴ Milton's first use is in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, where he quotes Trajan's words in English, "Take this drawn sword," saith he, 'to use for me, if I reign well; if not, to use against me.'" [ed. Symmons, 2, 280]! the second, in his *Defensio* [Prima] *Pro Populo Anglicano*, where he quotes them in Latin, "*Accipe hunc gladium pro me, si recte agam, sin aliter, in me magio . . .*" [ed. Symmons, 5, 145]. These words are a combination of Aurelius Victor and Dion Cassius. And, third, again in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, though he does not speak of the Trajan parallel, he quotes the inscription stamped on the first coins struck in Scotland after the coronation of James VI: "*Si mereor, in me.*" [ed. Symmons, II, 293].²⁵

Perhaps Whyte's exact source is undiscoverable; probably there is none, or it is a combination of many. But if he is correct in his assumption that, when Henry goes through the symbolical act of committing into the hand of the Lord Chief-Justice the "unstained sword that you have us'd to bear," Shakspeare had Trajan's symbolism in mind, then we have not only a source for the lines discussed, but also a hint that Shakspeare had a wider knowledge of Latin literature than has been supposed.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹DNB.

²Thomas Moore, *Memoirs of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, London, 1827, I, 3.

³Preface, pp XXXII-XXXIII, to "The Theatre," a poem Whyte had published in 1790 and which he republished, together with a long preface, in *A Collection of Poems*.

⁴See my forthcoming note in *MLN*, "A Dublin Milton Enthusiast"

⁵The whole inscription was "*Pro Me. Si Mereor. In Me.*" Milton's mention of this inscription was noted by Berge in his "Essais sur le règne de Trajan," in *Bibliothèque de L'école Des Hautes Etudes*, Paris, 1877, 32, 84, n.

October, 1940

Vol. 15, No. 4

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



Baudelaire and Shakspeare

"A Daniel Come to Judgment"

Studies in the Greene-Shakspeare Relationship

The Authorship of "Timon of Athens"

Shakspeare for Pleasure



Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 118th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET

New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH

15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.
Major Edward Bowes
Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.
Hardin Craig, Ph.D.
Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.
Frank Gilmore
Walter Hampden
Frank J. Hogan
Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.
George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.
Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.
Fritz Leiber
Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.
Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.
John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.
Julia Marlowe, LL.D.
Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.
Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.M.
Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.
Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.
Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.
Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.
Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Otis Skinner, A.M.
Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.
John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison
70 Broadway
New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum
601 West 113th Street
New York

Board of Directors

1936

John Robert Gregg
Paul Kaufman
Robert M. Smith
Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1937

Miss Olive I. Carter
Arthur Heine
Frank L. Short
Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1938

George W. Davison
John E. Hannigan
John H. H. Lyon
Miss Charlotte E. Porter
A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS

ROBERT M. SMITH

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS

HARDIN CRAIG

WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON

VOL. 15

OCTOBER, 1940

NO. 4

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Baudelaire and Shakspeare | <i>Max I. Baym</i> 195 |
| "A Daniel Come to Judgment" | <i>Cyrus H. Gordon</i> 206 |
| Studies in the Greene-Shakspeare Relationship | <i>Thomas H. McNeal</i> 210 |
| A Classical vs. A Social Approach to Shakspeare's Autolycus | <i>Merritt Y. Hughes</i> 219 |
| The Authorship of "Timon of Athens" | <i>Ralph A. Haug</i> 227 |
| Shakspeare for Pleasure | <i>I. C. Keller</i> 249 |
| <i>Communication: The Ancestry of Autolycus</i> | <i>William T. Hastings</i> 253 |
| Editorial Comment | <i>S. A. T.</i> 254 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

BAUDELAIRE AND SHAKSPERE

[Concluded]

By MAX I. BAYM

BAUDELAIRE, whose injunction to himself was *Sois toujours poète, même en prose*,⁹⁹ was of necessity fascinated by music. His theory of *correspondences*, taken partly from Poe, who believed (as did Walter Pater after him) that all the arts aspired to the condition of music, drew music into the chain of interlocking stimuli and reactions. "Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent."¹⁰⁰ In his aspiration towards the infinite—such aspiration constituting one of the important phases of the Romantic Movement in all of its stages—Baudelaire found in music intimations of the infinite extension of space: 'la sensation de l'espace étendu jusqu'aux dernières limites concevables'.¹⁰¹

It is in this infinite sea of space¹⁰² that the aspiring soul expresses its mystic ardours and its reach for an incommunicable God.¹⁰³ Wagner exemplified all this for Baudelaire and acted 'irrésistiblement sur l'esprit' and made him think of 'la manière large et aisée de Shakspeare'.¹⁰⁴ Music becomes a condition for spiritual and moral values. In it 'La pauvre humanité est rendue à sa patrie'.¹⁰⁵ It is certainly significant that in talking of music, notably in his essay on *Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser*, he had Shakspeare clearly in his foreconsciousness, as may be seen from the number of times he refers to him there, and the reproach he makes to Ponsard for not knowing how to spell correctly the Christian name of the Bard.¹⁰⁶

It is not too much to assume, then, that the author of *La Musique*, who said:

La musique souvent me prend comme une mer!
Vers ma pâle étoile¹⁰⁷

remembered very well the passage on music put into the mouth of Lorenzo in *The Merchant of Venice*;—and his reading in Poe¹⁰⁸ certainly helped to call his attention to it:

The man that hath no music in himself,

Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet sounds,
 Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.
 The motions of his spirit are dull as night
 And his affections dark as Erebus.
 Let no such man be trusted. Mark the music.¹⁰⁹

Space will not permit the elaboration of details, but it is quite clear that the common denominators found by Professor Nicolson in Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads* and in *Les Fleurs du Mal*—

- 1) embittered reticence
- 2) an acid savour of frustration
- 3) 'the expense of spirit in a waste of shame'
- 4) the bruised poisons of pains¹¹⁰

may also be traced in parallel fashion, in Shakspeare's *Sonnets*. The Marlovian and Shaksperian stamp in Baudelaire's treatment of death is quite patent. For both the Bard and Baudelaire Death is a dark velvet backdrop which intensifies the values of Love, Art, and Time—the three great themes (*matières*) of the *Sonnets* and *Les Fleurs du Mal*. Life, it appears, exacts a ransom from each of us. According to Baudelaire there are two ways of paying it: "L'un est l'art et l'autre l'Amour."¹¹¹ And as for Time, "Pour ne pas sentir l'horrible fardeau du *Temps* qui brise vos épaules et vous penche vers la terre, il faut vous enivrer sans trêve."¹¹²

In both works there is the awareness that "Le gouffre infranchissable, qui fait l'incommunicabilité, reste infranchi."¹¹³ While in the *Sonnets* Elizabethan sunlight breaks in to relieve that awareness, in the *Flowers of Evil* Schopenhauerian or Pascalian gloom augments it.—Whereas we know little of Shakspeare's life, we do know a great deal about Baudelaire's: the tragic sense of his own isolation, his "one long labour, in which time, money and circumstances were all against him."¹¹⁴ No doubt, all this contributed to the gloom that plays in the Baudelairean garden. It is erroneous, however, to think of the French poet as a 'gardener of evil'.¹¹⁵ If he was a stern analyst of evil, he did not mean to garner it. His cynicism was directed against it as well as against himself. We find this self-directed cynicism in *L'Héautontimorouménos*¹¹⁶ (The Self-Tormentor), a poem, which, for Symonds¹¹⁷, as well as

for me, is highly reminiscent of Timon of Athens. But, withal,

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men *observingly* distil it out".¹¹⁸

As an analyst of evil, Baudelaire would say with Jaques:

... "Give me leave
To speak my mind, and I will through and through
Cleanse the foul body of the infected world" . . .¹¹⁹

In 1857 Sainte-Beuve, who had a tremendous influence on Baudelaire, wrote to the latter and told him that he liked more than one poem in *Les Fleurs du Mal*; that he liked especially *Tristesses de la Lune*, "délicieux sonnet qui semble de quelque poète anglais contemporain de la jeunesse de Shakspeare."¹²⁰ After 1857,¹²¹ the year in which the first edition of the *Flowers of Evil* had been published, Baudelaire went on working: adding some poems, working at various plans and articles, giving lectures and fighting off more and more feebly the 'fell sergeant, Death!'

In 1863 he sent a letter to Swinburne¹²² who, in 1862, had reviewed glowingly the *Fleurs du Mal* in the *Spectator*.¹²³ "I should never have believed," said Baudelaire, "that an English *littérateur* could penetrate so well French beauty, French intentions (or meanings) and French prosody." It is significant, we think, that Swinburne, whose Hugolâtrerie was notorious, and who never talked of Hugo without mentioning the name of Shakspeare (and *vice versa*), brings in the name of Baudelaire in his *Study of Shakespeare*. There, discussing the difference between unimaginative Realism and imaginative Reality, he quotes Baudelaire à propos of this: "I have been many a time astonished, that to pass for an observer should be Balzac's great title to fame. To me it had always seemed that it was his chief merit to be a visionary and a passionate visionary. . . . All his fictions are as deeply colored as dreams. From the highest of the aristocracy to the lowest of the mob all the actors in his *Human Comedy* are keener, are living, more active and cunning in their struggles, more staunch in endurance of misfortune, more ravenous in enjoyment, more angelic in devotion, than the comedy of the real world shows them to us." This criticism would be equally true of Shakspeare's characters,

and that is the point of quoting Baudelaire here. By the time Swinburne sat down to write *Atalanta* he had fallen under the Baudelairean spell, 'the dream carved in stone.'¹²⁴

The year 1864 arrived and with it the celebration all over Europe of the 300th anniversary of Shakspeare's birth. Baudelaire's reaction to this event in France may be seen from what follows, and finds its analogue in the reaction of some people in England at the same time.

IV.

Opposed to the union of art and politics; to using the 300th anniversary of the birth of Shakspeare as an occasion for the launching of Hugo's book on the Bard, timed exactly to appear on the anniversary date; and angered, no doubt, by the fact that he was not invited to be a member of the committee that was to arrange the celebration of Shakspeare's birth, Baudelaire addressed a letter, which he signed with three stars, to *Figaro* of April 14, 1864—the very paper in which had previously appeared several attacks on himself. The shots of attack in *this* letter may be enumerated as follows:

Firstly, he didn't see why Finland, where the Poet was *not* born, had to celebrate His birthday. Why didn't France, for example, celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Chateaubriand or of Balzac? "People might tell me that their glory is still too young. But how about Rabelais?" Secondly, even supposing that all the literary men of Europe were moved to this spontaneous celebration out of a sense of grateful recognition, were the Parisian *littérateurs* really motivated by such a disinterested feeling, or were they rather the dupes of a small, self-seeking *coterie*? Thirdly, who were the members of the committee? M. Guizot, who made a poor translation of Shakspeare, and that soulless mandrake, M. Villemain, who would cut a funny figure indeed in front of the statue of the most impassioned poet in the world; while men like Philarète Chasles and Émile Deschamps had been excluded; Gautier came *near* being excluded, and Eugène Delacroix (fortunately dead), the translator of *Hamlet* in his own medium, *would* have been excluded. Yes, and M. Charles Baudelaire, whose taste in Saxon literature is well known, had been forgotten. In the

fourth place—and here we must quote Baudelaire literally: “You know, sir, that in 1848 there was concluded an *adulterous* alliance between the literary school of 1830 and Democracy, an alliance at once monstrous and bizarre. Olympio (*i.e.*, Hugo) abjured the famous doctrine of *Art for Art’s Sake*, and since then he, his family, and his disciples have not ceased preaching to the people and showing themselves on all occasions as the assiduous friends and patrons of the masses. *Tendre et profond amour du peuple!* Since *then*, all that they can love in literature has taken on revolutionary and philanthropic color. Shakespeare is a socialist! He never suspected it,—but never mind. . . . We are familiar with this sort of calculated delusion.” Finally, to sum up, this banquet (for which the birth of Shakspeare is a mere pretext) will serve the following ends:

- a) to make way for, and to promote the success of, V. Hugo’s book on Shakspeare (a book full of beauty and foolishness);
- b) to proffer a toast to Denmark. One owes it to Hamlet, the best known prince of Denmark.
- c) to top the unique crescendo of events marking the idiocy of the masses who are busy offering up toasts to Jean Valjean, to universal brotherhood, etc., etc., ‘and to all the stupidities characteristic of this 19th century, in which we have the depressing happiness of living and in which each one of us is deprived of the natural right of choosing his neighbor.’

Such was the content of the letter Baudelaire addressed to *Figaro*.¹²⁵ Naturally, there were repercussions. According to a letter he wrote from Belgium to his mother, the libel was suddenly spread by swine of “la bande d’Hugo” that he (Baudelaire) belonged to the French police. “C’est une vengeance à propos d’une lettre que j’ai publiée à Paris, et où je me moquais du fameux banquet shakspearien.”

As a matter of fact, Victor Hugo’s book on Shakspeare is a fascinating work,¹²⁶ for all of its dithyramb, and quite apart from what it says or does not say about Shakspeare. But Baudelaire, in 1864, already abnormal and involved in all sorts of personal and material difficulties in Brussels, came to hate Hugo and was hardly in a position any longer to judge the latter’s work fairly. He still admits his genius,

but adds ironically: "Je n'accepterais ni son génie, ni sa fortune, s'il me fallait au même temps posséder ses énormes ridicules."¹²⁷

Baudelaire had been saving up ill-will against himself since 1857, the year when *Les Fleurs du Mal* made its dramatic and inauspicious appearance.¹²⁸ It did not help him much to declare that "Hugo's reputation is so well established that he doesn't need this or that particular person's admiration."¹²⁹ On December 4, 1856, Ponsard delivered his discourse of reception into the Academy. According to Baudelaire, who referred to this *discourse* in 1861,¹³⁰ the *deplorable academician* introduced into his speech an appreciation of the genius of Shakspeare, "qu'il appelait familièrement le vieux *Williams*, ou *le bon Williams*." Such an appreciation was worthy, he said, of a concierge of the Comédie-Française: "J'ai senti en frissonnant le dommage que ce pédant sans orthographe allait faire à mon pays." Then he goes on to tell how for several days the English newspapers made fun of the French. "Les littérateurs français, à les entendre, ne savaient pas même l'orthographe du nom de Shakspeare; ils ne comprenaient rien à son génie, et la France abêtie ne connaissait que deux auteurs, Ponsard et Alexandre Dumas fils,¹³¹ les poètes favoris du nouvel Empire." He adds correctly: "Notez que la haine politique combinait son élément avec le patriotisme littéraire outragé." While in the 1865 edition of Ponsard's speech there are references to 'le divin William' and 'ce bonhomme Shakspeare', needless to say there is no trace of the scandalous 'vieux Williams' or 'le bon Williams'.¹³²

The 1864 letter, therefore, came as one of a series the public had become accustomed to. Incidentally, it is amusing to notice, with respect to the 1864 celebration of the Tercentenary of Shakspeare's birth, that the situation in England paralleled that in France. There, too, there were differences, disputes, quarrels and recriminations. All of this is revealed in a pamphlet found in the Rare Book Room of the Boston Public Library. It is by D. Gordon¹³³ and is entitled *Ethics of the Shakespeare Celebration*, published in London, 1864. The author attended a meeting of Birmingham operatives where plans were made for the Shakspeare centenary. He

pokes fun at the oratory and the Shakspeare mania. Why demonstrate at all? This is nothing but a National Puppet Show. In these times "a day's notoriety can be had for next to nothing." Tompkins and Higginbottom will "favor us with a sumptuous poem," but not Tennyson or Kingsley, Mr. Ruskin, Dean Stanley, Dickens, or E. B. Lytton. "April 23 will be the Day of the triumph of the great Nobodies." J. C. Bellew, a religious luminary of the first magnitude, will preside and "a great deal of insufferable poetry will be produced." Gordon ends with the statement that it is scandalous to worship genius when Jesus is recognized. Carlyle is to blame for all this fostering of worship of genius, so is Benjamin Disraeli (who is also attacked).¹⁸⁴—In general, it might be added, that English publications of the day satirized members of the National Shakspeare Committee for "endeavoring to reap honor for themselves by writing their own little names by the side of the great Shakespeare."¹⁸⁵ This parallels Baudelaire's outcry against the mandrake Villemain 'in front of the statue of the most impassioned poet in the world.'¹⁸⁶

But to return to Baudelaire. It is clear that for him Shakspeare had become the symbol of Poetry itself constantly being attacked and pulled down to the materialistic level of the bourgeoisie and their self-seeking prophets, who learned to use the demagogic slogans of the hour. Hugo himself became, for the Baudelaire of 1864, the arch demagogue invoking the name of the Arch-Poet!

V.

Given the genius of a Baudelaire, everything that passed through the alembic of his imagination conspired to produce *Les Fleurs du Mal*: early childhood impressions, the Bible, Latin decadent literature, Pascal, a taste for metaphysics, early manhood experiences with women and men, admiration of the whole body of European romantic literature, including Goethe, Chateaubriand, Sainte-Beuve, Victor Hugo, De Vigny, Eugène Delacroix in the arts, Mrs. Radcliffe, Walpole, Maturin, Poe, Hoffman, Shelley, Keats, De Quincey, (even Longfellow). Take all these facets and you have the Shaksperian mirror in which the imagination frames the figure of Hamlet as a reflection of

the beholder. It is this figure that goes 'wandering in the fields where curiosity is forbidden to go, approaching the dark gulf near enough to look in.'¹³⁷ From these fields, or in them, sprang the *Flowers of Evil*.

In Baudelaire we have the whole complexity of the modern soul,¹³⁸ which in one of its aspects is characterized by the so-called aesthetic shiver—that 'frisson nouveau' which Hugo said Baudelaire had discovered. His imagery is at many points that of Keats¹³⁹ touched with a Dantian sombreness out of which Milton's Satan frequently peers. In him, too, we have the 'ironie amère' of such poets as Heine and Byron. But what Keats, Milton, Heine¹⁴⁰ and Byron owed to Shakspeare represents the sum-total (not quite) of what Baudelaire owed to the author of *Hamlet*. We can now understand the full meaning of Paul Fort and Louis Mandin's reference to Baudelaire as "ce génie composite, cet Hamlet plus compliqué que celui de Shakespeare. . ."¹⁴¹ He is more complicated to the extent that modern life is more complex than was that of the Elizabethan period.¹⁴²

Hugo and Lamartine may have tried to write, at times, like Shakspeare; Baudelaire is Shaksperian. The 'tintamaré' of Victor Hugo (to borrow a word from Proust) is rhetoric in hose and doublet; the *mal* of Baudelaire is Hamlet, no longer an actor, but an act of the torn spirit of modern man.

Drama, as theatrical form, Baudelaire did not hold in the highest esteem. He considered it as the least inspiring of all forms of art. He seems to have neither praise nor blame for Shakspeare as a dramatist. To be sure, some of his own poems are dramas in miniature; but they deal (as Rhodes says) with the drama carried on in the depths of his own heart.¹⁴³ The adult's demand for the clap-trap of the theatre is put to shame by the imaginative power of children who turn a chair so readily into a train. "The plays of Shakspeare could remain beautiful," Baudelaire claims, "even if staged with properties of a barbaric simplicity."¹⁴⁴

We might say, then, that Baudelaire appreciated and admired Shakspeare as a poet who employed dramatic in-

tensities in his poetry. On the other hand, D'Aurevilly thought that Baudelaire, though very lyrical in expression, was at bottom a dramatic poet and that his *Fleurs du Mal* was a nameless drama in which he (Baudelaire) was the universal actor. He was like Shakspeare, D'Aurevilly says, in that he did not flinch in the presence of details, no matter how revolting; but unlike him, in that he could not remain impersonal; he couldn't escape 1800 years of Christianity. The Christian in him is paramount—

*Ab! Seigneur! donnez-moi la force et le courage
De contempler mon coeur et mon corps sans dégoût*¹⁴⁵

"It is characteristic of Shakspeare," says Lilly B. Campbell,¹⁴⁶ "that he treats the passion of grief in all its possibilities, that he embodies in different characters the different phases of the passion that he wishes to present, and that he discusses the physiological and psychological aspects of the passion, together with the particular moral problems which interested his period, and which were most closely related to the passion anatomized in this particular work." Keeping in mind that grief equals *douleur*, and that the problem of *evil* was as important in Baudelaire's day as in Shakspeare's, what Miss Campbell has to say of Shakspeare is equally true of Baudelaire.

"Don Juan, Dante, Hamlet, quels échos l'orgueil, l'inquiétude, l'angoisse de ces tourmentés soulèveront dans *les Fleurs du mal*!" exclaims a French student¹⁴⁷ of Baudelaire.

After Shakspeare's blood had been transfused in the veins of poets that followed him, Baudelaire's book of poems was to become for a full century¹⁴⁸ the breviary of 'the progress of the passions.'¹⁴⁹

During the last three years of his life he could well ask Hamlet's question and answer it in the Dane's fashion:

What is he whose grief
Bears such an emphasis, whose phrase of sorrow
Conjures the wand'ring stars and makes them stand
Like wonder-wounded hearers? This is I,
Hamlet, the Dane!¹⁵⁰

The Dane?—No; a French poet who was preoccupied with 'the perpetual and simultaneous relation of the ideal and life'—'*du rapport perpétuel, simultané de l'idéal avec la*

vie'; a modern poet who distilled beauty from pain, sorrow, and guilt, and who in that distillation was a noble descendant of that other poet whom the world calls her own with each returning Spring,—William Shakspeare!

Brooklyn, N. Y.

⁹⁹Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 669 (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu).

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 487 (Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser)

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, 488.

¹⁰²The association of *infinity* (infinite time, infinite space) with music has a long history. In the latter part of the 19th century this association is to be found in the Symbolists. Also, to a remarkable extent, the developmental novel, in the latter part of the 19th and in the 20th century is built on the twin themes of Time and Music, the latter being an expression of the former.

¹⁰³Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, (Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser) 497

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, 498.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, 516. The essay on Wagner was written in 1860.

¹⁰⁷In *Spleen et Idéal* series.

¹⁰⁸*Vide supra*, n. 77.

¹⁰⁹*Merchant of Venice*, V, i, 83f.

¹¹⁰Nicolson, Harold, *Swinburne and Baudelaire* (The Zaharoff Lecture, Oxf., 1930), p. 12

¹¹¹*La Raçon*, in *Nouvelles Fleurs du Mal*.

¹¹²*Poèmes en Prose* (Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, 1, 468.)

¹¹³Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 658

¹¹⁴Symons, 88

¹¹⁵Many still regard him as such.

¹¹⁶In *Spleen et Idéal* series.

¹¹⁷Symons, 47.

¹¹⁸*Henry V*, iv, i, 4-5. (Italics mine).

¹¹⁹*As You Like It*, II, vii, 58-60.

¹²⁰*Les Fleurs du Mal*, précédées d'une Notice par T. Gautier, Paris, 1868, pp 397-8.

¹²¹That year (Friday, Sept. 11, 1857) he went, together with Madame Sabatier, to see his friend Rouvière play in *King Lear*. (*Vide Lettres*, 1841-66, 143)

¹²²This letter was lost in transit and was not discovered till 1912. He had also sent Swinburne a copy of *Wagner et Tannhäuser à Paris* (1861).

¹²³In 1862 Swinburne also reviewed Meredith's *Modern Love*, that came out that year "An astonishing feat in the vivisection of the heart in verse," Symons called it. (See Symons, 87). In the same year Swinburne became acquainted with the *Rubayat* and with *Leaves of Grass*.

¹²⁴Lafourcade, Georges—Swinburne, *A Literary Biography*. London, 1932, p 112

¹²⁵Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 762-66.

¹²⁶See Hooker, Kenneth Ward, *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England*. N Y, 1938. Hugo's book was originally intended as a prefatory essay to his son's translation of Shakspeare. It appeared simultaneously in an English version. Some critics and reviews saluted it. Frank Marzials in the newly-established *Reader*, the *Athenaeum* and *Blackwood's*. Fraser's, on the other hand, said "The author of *Les Misérables* ought not to have published such ill-digested works as the *Vie de Shakspeare*." (Hooker, 159).

¹²⁷Quoted in Symons, 85

¹²⁸Court proceedings against *Les Fleurs du Mal* had ben brought about by a notorious article written by Gustave Bourdin; it appeared in *Figaro*, July 5, 1857. (*Vide Baudelaire, Oeuvres*, II, 762, n).

¹²⁹In a letter addressed to *Figaro*, June 13, 1858. (*Vide Oeuvres*, II, 450)

¹³⁰*Ibid.*, 516.

¹³¹In 1865 Baudelaire wrote in one of his letters: "Je suis bien aise que le fils de

Dumas se marie. J'espère que les douleurs du mariage le puniront de sa détestable littérature." (*Lettres*, 1841-66, p. 397).

¹⁸²a) The *Discours de Réception* was made by Ponsard in 1856 (not in 1858, as Ferran seems to indicate on p. 664, note 173). No reference there to 'le bon Williams'. This mangling of the Bard's Christian name may have occurred in the original speech and in that way created journalistic notoriety and also reached Baudelaire, who was scandalized.

b) Ponsard praises Shakspeare and then contrasts with him Racine (arriving after Shakspeare), avec son langage toujours pur, harmonieux . . . , avec sa logique, etc. Quelle surprise; quelle nouveauté! quel enthousiasme pour le révolutionnaire Racine! Quelle pitié, pour cet arriéré, ce vieux, ce bonhomme Shakspeare! F. Ponsard, *Oeuvres Compl. Disc. de Ré à L'Acc. Fr.* 1856, pp. 27, 28).

¹⁸³Boston Public Library Rare Book Room (G 3942 25 No. 4, 41 pp.). Sub-titled, *A Letter Addressed to a Lady in Sheffield*. Written in N. Sunderland, March 31, 1864, about the April 23rd Celebration of that year. I am grateful to Mr. Roger Thomas of Cambridge, who copied the material for me.

¹⁸⁴Further insight into the English Celebration paralleling the French, may be gained by consulting the *Reader* for Dec. 19, 1863, and the *Athenaeum* for Jan. 2, 1864. In the latter we find a dispute between Henry Vizetelly and W. H. Dunn, editor of the *Athenaeum*. J. C. Jeaffreson, hon. sec. of the National Shakespeare Commitee was involved. Thackeray was refused a vice-presidency in this group, though Dickens and Tennyson were vice-presidents.

¹⁸⁵"Pamphlets on the Shakespeare Tercentenary." Boston Public Library Rare Book Room

¹⁸⁶Vide ante, 131, 138.

¹⁸⁷Symons, 37. (Symons quotes these words from Lamb).

¹⁸⁸Paul Fort et Louis Mandin. *Histoire de la Poésie Française* depuis 1850. Paris, 1926, p. 21.

¹⁸⁹Symons, 19.

¹⁹⁰Baudelaire, in writing to Janin, takes up the cudgels for Heine against Janin and associates the German poet's name with that of Byron and Shakspeare (*Oeuvres*, II, 605).

¹⁹¹Paul Fort et Mandin, p. 27

¹⁹²Baudelaire himself defined 'l'homme sensible moderne' as a person who "is distinguished by a nervous and passionate temperament, a cultured mind, trained in the secrets of the plastic arts, a sensitive heart, attuned to sorrow, but easily excited and enthused. A taste for metaphysics and for the complex problems of philosophy and the human destiny are not foreign to his nature, nor a love for virtue . . . ; and above all, an inner urge for personal dignity and human pride, things rare today, with which to combat and destroy the empire of the commonplace." (Quoted in Rhodes, II, 365).

¹⁹³Rhodes, II, 297

¹⁹⁴Baudelaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 138

¹⁹⁵Les Fleurs du Mal, précédées d'une Notice par T. Gautier. Paris. 1868 pp 369, 371. (Contains an *Appendice* of D'Aureville).

¹⁹⁶Campbell, Lily B., *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes*, 1930, p. 113

¹⁹⁷Ferran, 276

¹⁹⁸The latter half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th.

¹⁹⁹Dr. Johnson's phrase

²⁰⁰*Hamlet*, V, i, 278-282.

"A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT"

By CYRUS H. GORDON

ARCHEOLOGICAL discovery in the Near East has been adding steadily to our knowledge of history and of the development of civilization. Since our Eastern heritage forever reverberates through Western life and art, the unfailing stream of important discoveries in the cradles of civilization is bound to throw light on (among other things) the sources of Western literature.

When the case seems to be going his way, Shylock exclaims:

"A Daniel come to judgment, yea, a Daniel!
O wise young judge! how I do honour thee!"
(*Merchant of Venice*, IV, i)

It is known that the reference is not to the canonical *Book of Daniel* but to the apocryphal *History of Susanna*, in which a youth named Daniel saves the life of the condemned Susanna and at the same time has her false accusers sentenced to death. Daniel handled the case so brilliantly that "from that day forth was Daniel had in great reputation in the sight of the people" (*Susanna*, v. 64).

Shakspeare was not well posted on Jewish life. If he had been, he would not have put a reference to *Susanna* in Shylock's mouth. The apocryphal books were banned by the early rabbis and effectively eliminated from Jewish life. It is thanks to the church that the Apocrypha were preserved in Greek, Latin and other translations. The Jewish originals in Hebrew and Aramaic have almost, if not entirely, disappeared, and certainly none of the Jewish originals could have been available to a Venetian Jew. Daniel of the *Book of Daniel* would be quite familiar to any Jew, but that Daniel was not a judge. A traditional Jew might compare a keen judge with Solomon but hardly with Daniel of *Susanna*.

It is interesting to note that the name "Daniel" is appropriate to a judge. The first part "*dan(i)*" is derived from the Semitic root meaning "to judge," while "*el*" is the familiar theophorous element.

We now know that the judge-hero Daniel is an ancient figure in the lore of Canaan. The Hebrews, Phoenicians and other kindred peoples of Canaan (i.e., Syria-Palestine) shared a common literary heritage. The Canaanite nations all employed the same structures of verse and strophe; their dialects were closely related, especially in the poetry; they fell heir to much the same stock of myth and legend. The latest major addition to our knowledge of the Canaanites comes from the French excavations at Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra) on the north Syrian coast. In the course of the last eleven years the spade of the archeologist has uncovered there a library of unique significance. The library contains clay tablets inscribed in a hitherto-unknown cuneiform alphabet. Most of the texts are myths and epics. They were written in their present form in the reign of Niqmed, king of Ugarit, who was a vassal of the Hittite monarch Suppiluliuma in the early part of the fourteenth century B.C. The Ugaritic poems are couched in a Canaanite dialect and possess unmistakable literary value. According to any reasonable system of chronology they are pre-Mosaic and pre-Homeric. In the opinion of the writer, the discovery of Ugaritic marks the greatest stride in the history of literature since the decipherment of Mesopotamian cuneiform in the nineteenth century. The importance of Ugarit is reflected in the length of the fifty-five page bibliography published over a year ago by the excavator of the site: M. Claude Schaeffer, *Ugaritica*, Paris, 1939, pp. 153-207. The bibliography is brought up to date in the present writer's *Ugaritic Grammar*, which is about to appear in Rome.

Among the Ugaritic poems is one that Professor Charles Virolleaud has published under the title *La Légende phénicienne de Danel* (Paris, 1936). This epic constitutes the most primitive account of the judge-hero Daniel. His identity is certain, for of him we read:

"He judges the case of the widow,
adjudicates the cause of the fatherless."

Daniel's story bears repetition. In the extant portions of the legend we learn that Daniel

"has no son as have his brothers,
nor a scion as have his kinsmen."

He accordingly wants a son who will (amusingly enough from our point of view) :

"hold his hand when drunk,
his arm when full of wine";

a son who will plaster his father's roof, wash his clothes and fulfill filial duties in the temple. The gods are won over by drinks no less than by prayer, and so Daniel's wife at last conceives and bears a son, Aqhat. Daniel's joy, however, was not to endure. The goddess Anat, acting in concert with the god Yatpan and with a flock of eagles, killed Aqhat so that

"his soul went out like wind,
his spirit like a puff;
like smoke out of his body."

One of the eagles devoured the body of Aqhat. After giving expression to his grief, Daniel resolves to retrieve his son's remains for burial. At length he spies a flock of eagles.

"He lifts his voice and shouts:
'May Baal break the wings of the eagles!
May Baal break their pinions!
May they fall at my feet!
I shall split their insides and look.
If there is fat,
If there is bone,
I shall weep and bury him.
I shall place him in the niche of the mute of the earth.'
As soon as the word goes forth from his mouth,
from his lips the utterance,
Baal breaks the wings of the eagles,
Baal breaks their pinions.
They fall at his feet.
He splits their insides and looks.
There is no fat,
there is no bone.
He ~~lifts~~ his voice and cries:
'May Baal ~~break~~ the wings of the eagles!
May (Baal) ~~mend~~ their pinions!
O eagles, flee and fly!'"

Undaunted by initial failure, Daniel sights Hargab, the father of the eagles. He brings him down with the same imprecation and, upon splitting his viscera, he again finds he has opened the wrong bird. After getting Baal to restore

Hargab, Daniel dismisses the father of the eagles. Finally, Daniel sees Samal, the mother of the eagles. Baal casts her down at Daniel's feet. On examining her insides, Daniel discovers

"there is fat,
there is bone."

Daniel removes the remains of Aqhat and, after weeping, buries him in an urn and proclaims:

"May Baal break the wings of the eagles,
may Baal break their pinions,
if they fly over the grave of my son!"

Daniel then goes into mourning for Aqhat

"from days to months,
from months to years,
until the seventh year."

Only then does Daniel stop weeping and dismiss the wailing women from his palace.

We do not know the outcome of the story because the closing portions are lost. However, a happy ending, with Aqhat restored to life, is not out of the question. For in those distant days when death did not seem so irrevocable, the dead might be brought back to life.

The judge-hero Daniel is also mentioned in *Ezekiel* 14:14 among the upright heroes of old: Noah, Daniel and Job. Critical scholars did not confuse this Daniel with his namesake of the lions' den, even before the epoch-making finds at Ugarit.

Accordingly, Daniel the judge is first attested at Ugarit in the fourteenth century B.C. Next he is alluded to in the Old Testament *Book of Ezekiel*. Then he recurs in *Susanna*, whence he finds his way into *The Merchant of Venice* in his pristine rôle as judge-hero.

Smith College
Northampton, Mass.

STUDIES IN THE GREENE-SHAKSPERE RELATIONSHIP

By THOMAS H. MCNEAL

THE Greene-Shakspere relationship, for all the speculation, romantic and otherwise, that has found its way into print, is, after all, a fairly simple matter. A young dramatist is moved by a sincere and lasting admiration for an older craftsman, an admiration that becomes possibly the greatest single influence in his literary life.

Only once is this enthusiasm threatened: during those few years after Greene's invective against the actor-playwright "Shakescene" in the *Groatsworth of Wit*. Evidently the elder writer's pocket-book had been touched, for more than rage at being pleasantly plagiarized must have stirred Greene. Certainly he had no word against Lodge's *Rosalynde*, which took over most of the technical tricks of the master's novels and used them to very good advantage.

But Shakspere's quarrel with his predecessor evidently began after Greene had quit the Elizabethan theatre, and the stage of life as well; and with no adversary present to fan the fires of retaliation into flame, his anger is short-lived and dies a natural and easy death. If Greene had lived and continued to gain popularity, and if he had been able to shame or otherwise force his disciple away from developing Dorotheas and Margarets into Rosalinds and Violas, one wonders what direction Shakspere's comic and tragi-comic genius might have taken. There could hardly have been a *Winter's Tale*, at any rate. But any choler that perhaps found its way into certain of his works directly following the death of Greene soon subsided. Greene's banished heroines masquerading in men's clothes, his villain-heroes, his faithful clowns, his charming outdoor scenes—all this paraphernalia of romantic comedy Shakspere went on borrowing as though Greene had not died with "Stop thief!" on his lips. Towards the very end, *Pandosto* is given a magnificent paraphrase, and Miranda and her Prince, in the *Tempest*, reflect the dead man's touch.

Thus Greene came early into the young dramatist's life

The unreality of such time-bitten notions comes in for a lashing in Shakspeare's *Sonnets XXI* and *CXXX*, pieces probably belonging, because of these ideas expressed in them, to the period of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*—two or three years after Greene's rebuke, and one or two after the appearance of *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame*. Sir Sidney Lee comments upon the satire of the two sonnets as follows:

Similarly in Sonnet CXXX, . . . the poet satirises the conventional lists of precious stones, metals, and flowers, to which the sonneteers likened their mistresses' features. It was not the only time that Shakespeare deprecated the sonneteer's practice of comparing features of women's beauty with the "earth and sea's rich gems." . . . Spenser in his *Amoretti*, No. ix., gives Shakespeare a very direct cue, as may be seen when Spenser's cited sonnet is read alongside Shakespeare's sonnet xxi.⁵

J. Q. Adams likewise finds satire and revolt against current literary fashions:

The same note of ridicule appears in Sonnet 21. . . . And in Sonnet 130 he laughs at the style of the conventional sonneteer.⁶

It is likely, however, that Shakspeare draws the bow in *Sonnet CXXX* for a target more particular than Elizabethan sonneteers in general—that the arrow is meant for *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame*. The poem is long, and contains much material not found in *Sonnet CXXX*. But if that passage wherein the lover lists the charms of his lady is placed beside Shakspeare's fourteen lines, some interesting parallels may be observed:

Greene:

Hir Amber tresses on hir shoulders lies,
The which as she doth moue, diuided run,
About hir bodie rust in circle wise,
Like to the curious web Arachne spun;
Or lese to make a fit comparison,
Like slender twist turned to shining fyre,
Or flames by woonder wrought into a wire
The forehead that confines these burnisht haire,
For whiteness striueth with vntouched snowe;
For smoothnes with the Iuorie compares,
And doth the Alabasters glistring showe,
Vnder this firmament you are to know,
Two powrfull stars which at their pleasure moue,
The variable effects that follows loue.

*Hir cheekes resembleth right a garden plot,
Of diuers sorts of rare Carnation flowres,
The which the scortching Sun offendeth not,
Nor boystrous winter with his rotting showres;
Vncertaine Iuno thereon neuer lowres:*

*Here Venus with hir little loues reposes,
Amongst the lillies and the damaske roses.*

*Hir lips compares with the Vermilion morne,
Hir equall teeth semicircle wise,
For orientnes selected pearle may scorne;
What may I of hir issuing breath deuise,
That from this pearle and Synaber doth rise:
The francumsense and myrr, that Inde presents,
Within this aire leese their extolled sents.*

*Girt with a tawnie Cyprous were hir clothes,
And thus attirde, this Angell woman goes.⁶*

Shakspere:

*My Mistres eyes are nothing like the Sunne,
Curral is farre more red, than her lips red,
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;
If haire be wiers, black wiers grow on her head:
I have seene Roses damaskt, red and white,
But no such Roses see I in her cheekes,
And in some perfumes is there more delight,
Then in the breath that from my Mistres reekes.
I love to heare her speake, yet well I know,
That Musicke hath a farre more pleasing sound:
I graunt I never saw a goddesse goe,
My Mistres when shee walkes treads on the ground.
And yet by heaven I thinke my love as rare,
As any she belid with false compare⁷*

The italicized lines show how particular is Shakspere's negation of the passage from *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame*. Granted that the whiteness of snow, the sweetness of breath, and hairs of wire are conventional comparisons in Elizabethan poetry, it is rather against the laws of chance that all of these and more should be served up in a satirical sonnet in much the same order that Greene previously arranged them in his last printed poem. The cutting thrust by which Shakspere has apparently turned an "Angell woman" into a creature of flesh and blood who "treads on the ground" is final and best internal evidence.

A Midsummer Night's Dream carries on this war against charm lists and spineless lovers and cruel ladies, expanding

them into sound and fury. At the very outset the comedy takes on the vaguely familiar though disjointed form of the love-vision. The title itself suggests the dream-poem; but instead of a May-day or spring-time setting, the accent is placed upon night, and the season is mad midsummer. Gradually Bottom and the lovers drift into the wood so often found in the old formula, led by Puck rather than the usual animal guide. Gradually each is put to sleep—each goes into a dream of madness—where women woo and are disdained and list their lovers' charms; where the old etiquette of courtly love is speared and slain. "I am your spaniel," says the unorthodox Helena to Demetrius. "Away, you Ethiopel!" cries Lysander to Hermia.

But reality returns with the day, and all are roused when "huntsmen wake them with their horns." It is difficult, however, to distinguish the real from the unreal in such matters.

Are you sure
That we are awake?

asks Demetrius;

It seems to me
That yet we sleep, we dream.

With that the farce of the love-vision is over,⁸ and Shakspeare turns in the last act to a final shot at another favorite theme of his, the weakness of the English stage.

The relation of the play to Robert Greene may be both general and particular. The man was especially vulnerable for satire in the field of the love-vision. Of the pieces that he composed towards the end of his troubled career, *Orpharion* (1588), *A Maidens Dreame* (1590), *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), *Greene's Vision* (1592), and *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame* (1593), all use in some form or other the dream plan.

It is the last of these works, however, that seems to bear the brunt of particular satire. Bully Bottom, awakening from the experiences of his love-vision, cries out:

I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream, past the wit
of man to say what dream it was: man is but an ass, if he go about

to expound this dream. Methought I was—; there is no man can tell what. Methought I was,—and methought I had,—but man is but a patched fool, if he will offer to say what methought I had. The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was. I will get Peter Quince to write a ballad of this dream: it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom (IV, viii, 208-21).

Bottom's statement, "I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream," may be taken as a rather obvious travesty of the title *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame*. Again, the poem is as long and rambling in content as it is in its full title, and might well be called "Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom." Furthermore, an examination of what "Bottom's Dream" must have been if Peter Quince had ever set it down on paper reveals an excellent burlesque of Greene's poem. For it is Titania who woos, while the hero remains coy; and it is Titania who lists the Ass-lover's charms—his "amiable cheeks," his "sleek smooth head," and his "fair large ears." The date of the poem, too, is an aid to the argument, for it was probably less than a year old when *A Midsummer Night's Dream* first saw the stage.

A connection between Greene and Bottom has already been argued. J. M. Brown, in "An Early Rival of Shakespeare," says:

Shakespeare, with all his tolerance, was unable to refrain from retaliation, but it is with no venomous pen that he retaliates . . . In the *Midsummer Night's Dream* . . . he takes this early school of amateur player-poets, and pillories them in Bottom, Quince, Snug, Flute, Snout, and Starveling; and with elfin machinery he borrows from Greene, and turns his caricature, Bottom, into everlasting ridicule.⁹

E. K. Chambers notes, relative to a line from Bottom's speech—"it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom"—that "Mr. Fleay suggests that there is here a hit at Robert Greene, who called one of his poems *A Maiden's Dream*, for the apparent reason that there was no maiden in it."¹⁰

Brown's suggestion, though interesting, is too general; and Fleay's note misses the point. That there was no maiden in the poem of *A Maidens Dreame* means nothing. The piece is an elegy, addressed to the Lady Elizabeth Hatton on the death of her uncle, Sir Christopher Hatton,

Lord Chancellor of England; and Greene probably felt that his words of consolation to this woman should be placed in the mouth of a woman. The date of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is a barrier, too. It has generally been placed between the years 1593-'96,¹¹ too long after the appearance of *A Maidens Dreame* (1590) for Bottom's satirical speech to have been understood by an audience. Also, there are missing in the poem situations that would lead to satire on courtly love. The poem is an elegy, not a love-vision; no lovers are present, only a dead knight. The listing of a woman's charms gives way to the recounting of a man's admirable and generous qualities. Finally, Shakspeare would hardly have satirized an elegy written on the death of the "late Lord Chancellor of England."

It is worth while to note how completely these difficulties that we encounter if we accept *A Maidens Dreame* as the butt of Bottom's jest disappear when we substitute for that poem *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame* (1593). That the literate part of Shakspeare's audience recognized the allusion is very probable. Robert Greene had been too well known in London for anybody who kept up with literature of the day not to have caught any significance in the word "dream" when it appeared in one of Shakspeare's titles—only a short time after the author had been described by a master given to "dreams" as "beautified with our feathers." Bottom's speech might thus have been anticipated. That the shot was fired at Greene's last and posthumous poem, appearing in the *Phoenix Nest* of recent date, likewise insured for the playwright an audience familiar with the work travestied.

[To be continued]

¹¹*The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*. The Clarendon Press, 1905, II, 219.

²*The Phoenix Nest*. Harvard University Press, 1931, p. 144, n. 39, 2.

³J. C. Jordan, *Robert Greene*, p. 142.

⁴*Ibid*, p. 143.

⁵*A Life of Shakespeare*. The Macmillan Co., 1916, p. 190; continued in n. 3.

⁶*The Phoenix Nest*, p. 34, ll. 25ff.

⁷*Sonnet CXXX*. J. O. Beatty and J. W. Bower, *Famous Editions of English Poets*. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1931, p. 50.

⁸So full is Shakspeare of his subject that it is almost inevitable that these ideas which are developed into the full-fledged play of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and touched upon in two of the sonnets should have spilled over into *Romeo and Juliet*,

a tragedy following close upon the heels of the comedy. At once we meet the artificial and sighing Romeo and the denying Rosaline. The reality of Juliet's love, however, intrudes and awakens the hero out of his ridiculous dream. An echo of the fun in the comedy appears when Mercutio calls out in ridicule of Romeo, "Cry but 'Aye me!'"—when in the very next scene Juliet breaks the silence of the night with that same conventional lover's sigh. There is rich comedy in the first balcony scene; and most of it grows out of Juliet's inability to hold to Petrarchan standards of love making. Her long apology to Romeo for not being able to pretend is excellent satire. But "farewell compliment!" she cries. Then, frightened at her own audacity, she adds,

Or, if thou think'st I am too quickly won,

I'll frown and be perverse and say thee nay.

⁹*New Zealand Magazine*, No. 6, pp. 97-133, 1877. Brown's article is substantially reproduced in Vol. I of Grosart's edition of Greene's works, from which this passage is taken, p. xviii.

¹⁰Arden Shakespeare, p. 123, note on IV, ii, 220-1.

¹¹R. A. Law, "On the Dating of Shakespeare's Plays." *S.A.B.* (1936), IX: 50.

A CLASSICAL *vs.* A SOCIAL APPROACH TO SHAKSPERE'S AUTOLYCUS

By MERRITT Y. HUGHES

“**A**UTOLYCUS,” says Miss Christine White, improving on the critics who have seen the rogue as “all English,” “reflects not only the outward, vivid details of Elizabethan low life but also . . . the social causes and the conditions that governed such a life and made it all too common in Elizabethan England.”¹ In her study the playboy to whom “’twas nothing to geld a codpiece of a purse” becomes “Shakspere’s final glance at the servant problem in Elizabethan England.”² We are asked to regard Autolycus as a social document of larger implication than a mere portrait of the ordinary prigman “whose property,” as John Awdeley said in *The Fraternity of Vagabonds*, it was to “steal clothes off the hedge.”³ Because on his own word the knave “served Prince Florizel and in (his) time wore three-pile,”⁴ we are expected to accept his story as Shakspere’s analysis of social forces that were bringing the pages of the great down to the revenue of “the silly cheat.”⁵ Miss White makes his background as vivid as Mr. Whibley does the whole background of low life in his chapter on “Rogues and Vagabonds” in *Shakespeare’s England*.⁶ She has ransacked the records of the Elizabethan underworld and scanned its economic history for evidence that Autolycus in *The Winter’s Tale* is a social document, and that his progress from courtier to rogue—against which “title and what else belongs to’t” he boasts that he is “proof”—interested Shakspere somewhat as the plight of the Joads interested Steinbeck. Her object is to make Autolycus socially significant for us and, less explicitly, for his creator.

Though, as she planned her article, Miss White may not have meant to attribute deliberate “social criticism” to Shakspere, that is what she does when she writes that he used Autolycus “to glimpse varying social planes and problems that in earlier plays he had portrayed in detail.”⁸ Her theory, if far pursued, would end in interpretations of that scapegrace and of those other younger sons of hypothetical decayed families—Orlando, Malvolio, and “Lear’s discharged retainers”⁹—which would parallel A. A. Smirnov’s

Marxist interpretation of Caliban as "a true revolutionary."¹⁰ Basically, however, her interest is historical rather than ideological; and, like all historical interpretations, hers must be judged on aesthetic grounds.

In comparison with the sentimentalized Autolycus of the nineteenth-century, who has not yet quite disappeared, Miss White gives us a much more convincing and satisfying figure. Beside it, Georg Brandes' conception of the rogue as on his way up rather than down in the world becomes ludicrous; and still more absurd becomes his declaration that Autolycus embodies Shakspeare's fondness for "the natural wit, good sense, and kind-heartedness of the lower classes"¹¹ whenever he had to portray a "clown." To have rediscovered that Autolycus has come down, not up, in life, and that he is not an amiable rustic, nor even the merely diverting rogue without a touch of malice in him which Robert Bridges saw and Professor Peter Alexander still sees,¹² is a long step toward the aesthetic truth about him. Yet those essential facts about him should have been as clear to Brandes and to Bridges as they were to Coleridge when he described Autolycus as "one who had lived and been reared in the best society, and had been precipitated from it by 'die and drab'."¹³ There is enough common ground between Miss White and Coleridge for us to compare his moralist's theory of the character with her view of it as a social historian. Because neither of them gives us a fundamentally comic conception, we shall do well to be sceptical of both, and to look further afield and deeper down in Shakspeare's imagination for some of the elements that went to the making of his most convincing rascal.

In different ways both Miss White and Coleridge betray uneasiness about the judgment that awaits their views at the bar of purely aesthetic judgment, when all the evidence on other levels is available and has been given its proper weight. Miss White treats Shakspeare's addition of his realistic rogue to "a romantic play of strange people in foreign lands, caught in an extraordinary tangle of circumstances" as a final touch of artistry, for "the strange and the extraordinary lose their effect unless there is the realistic and commonplace to supply adequate contrast."¹⁴ Coleridge, thinking chiefly of Autolycus' impact upon the lovely third

scene of the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale*, found that it struck against his "feelings as a note out of tune, and as not coalescing with the *pastoral* tint which gives such charm to the . . . act."¹⁵ Of the conclusion to Autolycus' first soliloquy—"for the life to come, I sleep out the thought of it"¹⁶—he said that "it is too Macbeth-like in the snapper-up of unconsidered trifles." For Coleridge, though Autolycus was no less vivid and actual a character than he is for us, he was less topical than tragic.

To modern readers a topical approach may seem less alien than a tragic one to the right comic interpretation of the character. Coleridge's comparison of Autolycus with Macbeth is absurd, yet it may remind us that in his drawing there is as much moral ambiguity as there is of physical metamorphosis in his four appearances in the play. He is a figure such as Pirandello would have liked to embroider. In his speeches we often have the tragi-comedy of character outstripped by intelligence. So we find it in the tirade after the shepherds have bought all his wares and had their purses picked into the bargain: "Ha, ha! what a fool Honesty is! and Trust, his sworn brother, a very simple gentleman!"¹⁷ The reasoning is reminiscent of Falstaff on honor, but instead of going on in that vein, Autolycus drops into a catalogue of the trumpery that he has sold. Again, after his attempt to gull the old shepherd and his son, when they are on their way with Perdita's tokens to Polixenes, his boasting in the soliloquy which ends the act rises to Pirandellian levels of irony: "If I had a mind to be honest, I see fortune would not suffer me; she drops booties in my mouth."¹⁸ The eternal confidence man gloats over his eternally imbecile victim. In just the form that he put it, Coleridge's criticism may be inept, but it establishes a kind of universality in Autolycus that is more than topical.

And, in fact, he is not a merely topical or a merely Elizabethan figure. Like the first bearer of his name, he was begotten on Parnassus, and his first speech tells us that he is aware of that fact. His first words are a confession that, in a slightly different sense from the first Autolycus in Homer, he was littered under Mercury."¹⁹ When he wrote that speech, Shakspeare was of course playing with the astrological notion that character corresponds with horoscope;

but he was not giving his rogue any delusions in the matter or furnishing him with the pseudo-scientific excuse of "an enforced obedience to planetary influence"²⁰ for being a gambler, thief and fornicator. Such a notion would have seemed no less "excellent foppery"²¹ to Autolycus than it did to Edmund in *Lear*. Shakspeare must have known, at least at second hand, Ovid's tale of Mercury's bold rape of the nymph, Chione, on the slopes of Mount Parnassus, and he would certainly have been familiar with the myth that blamed, not the stars, but Autolycus' own father, the god, for his character. As George Sandys translated the story:

Nor from the Sire the Sonne degenerates,
Cunning in theft, and wily in all sleights:
Who could with subtiltie deceaue the sight;
Converting white to black, and black to white.²²

Ovid's ultimate source for his yarn is usually traced in the nineteenth book of the *Odyssey*, where, in a long digression, Ulysses remembers a childhood visit to Autolycus' hunting lodge in a glen on Mount Parnassus, and recalls that the old man, his grandfather, had been (in Chapman's words) with

"th'art
Of theft and swearing (not out of the heart,
But by equivocation) first adorn'd,
Your witty man withal, and was suborn'd
By Jove's descent, ingenious Mercury,
Who did bestow it."²³

Neither Homer nor Ovid, however, gives us an Autolycus of definitely comic enough character to have suggested more than the choice of the name to Shakspeare. Nor can his imagination have found anything to stimulate it in Ovid's only other reference to Autolycus, a very casual one, recalling the marriage of the love-child of Hermes with the daughter of the oath-breaker, Erisichtheus,

qui numina divum
sperneret et nullos aris adoleret odores.²⁴

The son-in-law of Erisichtheus might be one to sleep out the thought of eternity, and perhaps one to sing catches about

me and my aunts,
While we lie tumbling in the hay."²⁵

Ovid's allusions to him and Homer's, when all are taken together, can hardly have been more than the starting point of Shakspeare's interest in him. Authorities as good as Sir Edmund Chambers over-simplify the matter in telling us that Shakspeare "took . . . Autolycus from *Odyssey*, xix, 394."²⁶ The figure there is too shadowy and heroic to have connected itself spontaneously with the one which took shape in Shakspeare's imagination, even though we assume him to have been very familiar with Homer. What we should look for as a prototype in the *Odyssey* would be a three-dimensional rogue drawn with the gusto of the portrait of Autolycus' father in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. But to find anything of that kind we must go to the development of the Greek myth by Italian myth-builders, the first of whom were probably the vulgar tellers of comic yarns about the gods on the streets of Plautus' Rome. The last of them, as we shall see, was the most popular of the Renaissance compilers of mythological lore. In these classical traditions it is certain that we should find one significant part of the background of Shakspeare's fancy for the name, Autolycus, and for his enrichment of the character with the "touch of poetry"²⁷ which President Aydelotte thinks lifts it out of the general run of realistic, English vagabonds.

In the obscure popular mythology of Rome Homer's Autolycus developed into a kind of Jonathan Wild the Great or picaresque Paul Bunyan. As far back as Plautus' allusion to him in the *Bacchides*, the process must have been well advanced. In that play the deluded father, Nicobulus, says, as he awakens to the fact that he has given his money to a sharper,

Deceptus sum, Autolico hospiti aurum credidi.²⁸

Popularly throughout the whole classical period, Autolycus must have been a by-word. So he appears in Martial's use of him as a yardstick to measure the notorious kleptomaniac to whose fists stuck the linen of his hosts and even the shoes of his own children:

Ne contemne caput; nihil est furacius illo.
Non fuit Autolici tam piceata manus.²⁹

If either of these passages, or others like them, ever came under Shakspeare's eye they would suggest an Autolycus

more like his in *The Winter's Tale* than would any of the traditionally cited passages in Homer or Ovid. In the standard editions of Plautus and Martial in the sixteenth century he would find notes duly deriving the name from the *Odyssey*,⁸⁰ but the picture in the minds of the annotators came to them from the vulgar mythological lore that found its way to the light in the compilations of the Renaissance mythographers, rather than from the literary sources that they decorously cited. Then, perhaps, because the editor had qualms such as Coleridge felt about the presence of a robber among the inhabitants of Parnassus, he ended his note with some doubts about the exact spot that was his home.

Where the Renaissance mythographers found the story of Autolycus, with the supplements that they added to the classical account, and how it developed in their hands, it is not necessary to inquire. Natale Conti's treatment⁸¹ of it may represent them all. In his chapter on Mercury he turns directly from the account of the god to his son, Autolycus, who became the grandfather of the wily Ulysses, and who inherited the most beggarly of all mortal arts, the art of stealing, from his father. Conti evidently revelled in his virtuosity as a rogue and in the rich hauls that Fortune brought him as unfailingly as she "dropped booties"⁸² into the mouth of Shakspeare's Autolycus. One of Conti's anecdotes is a tale of Autolycus' detection in the theft of a splendid horse and his success in palming off a mangy ass on his victim as full reimbursement.⁸³ Another of the tales gives us Autolycus stealing a friend's lovely wife and replacing her with a toothless hag.⁸⁴ No one penetrated his impostures, for he inherited his father's command of prestidigitation. Only the cleverest of men, Sisyphus, when his herds had been spirited away, was ready to outwit Autolycus. A sigma branded in the hoofs of his cattle established his ownership. Lost in admiration of Sisyphus' shrewdness, Autolycus asked and got the hand of his daughter, and by her he became the father-in-law of Laertes, whose son Ulysses was to be.⁸⁵ At this point Conti quoted and translated the passage in the *Odyssey* to which Sir Edmund Chambers sends us as Shakspeare's source for the name and genealogy of his Autolycus. But may we not surmise that stories such as Conti had to tell were more present ferments

in Shakspeare's imagination than Homer's meagre passage; and that when he created his tragi-comic rogue the picaresque Autolycus of Plautus and Conti breathed his spirit into the scoundrel at whose ruses the gods "connive"¹⁸ in *The Winter's Tale*?

University of Wisconsin
Madison.

¹Christine White, "A Biography of Autolycus," *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, Vol. XIV (July, 1939), pp. 158-168.

²*Ibid.*, p. 10.

³*The Fraternity of Vagabonds*, edited by A. V. Judges in *The Elizabethan Underworld*, 1930, p. 53.

⁴*The Winter's Tale*, edited by F. W. Moorman in *The Works of William Shakespeare*, London, 1912, IV, iii, 13-14.

⁵*Ibid.*, IV, iii, 27-28.

⁶*Shakespeare's England*, 1917, Vol. II, pp. 483-500.

⁷*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 837-838.

⁸White, *Op. cit.*, 165.

⁹*Ibid.*, 159 and 165.

¹⁰A. A. Smirnov, *Shakespeare: A Marxist Interpretation*, 1936, p. 87.

¹¹Georg Brandes, *William Shakespeare*, translated by William Archer, Mary Morison and Diana White, 1935, p. 641. Insofar as Autolycus is a satirical figure, his direction on the social ladder is not very important. Between his fall from "three-pile" before the opening of *The Winter's Tale* and his recovery of a courtier's status in the last act, he combines the characters of both courtier and curpse with others that had long been familiar in dramas like *A Knack to Knowe a Knave*, and he does his best to rise in most of the callings adopted by the four sons of the Bailiff of Hexham.

¹²Robert Bridges, "On the Influence of the Audience," in *The Shakespeare Head Press Edition of The Works of William Shakespeare*, 1907, Vol. X, p. 331. Mr. Alexander stresses the importance (in *Shakespeare's Life and Art*, 1939, p. 210) of what Mr. Mark Van Doran calls (in *Shakespeare*, 1939, p. 320) "the surpassing roguery of Autolycus" in the merriment of the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale*. The elements of the courtier, the rake and the poet in him are recognized in Mr. Hazelton Spencer's analysis in *The Life and Art of William Shakespeare*, (1940), p. 243.

¹³*Coleridge's Shakespearian Criticism*, edited by Thomas M. Raysor, 2 Vols., 1930 Vol. I, p. 120.

¹⁴White, *Op. cit.*, 164.

¹⁵Coleridge, *Op. cit.*, I, 120. Insofar as Autolycus is a criminal and not a play-boy, his brags and his amorism are explicable as Professor E. E. Stoll explains such traits in his chapter on "The Criminals" in *Shakespeare Studies* (1927, p. 337). Mr. Stoll is unquestionably right in asserting (p. 342) that "in no case does Shakespeare represent men as overwhelmed by anything so vague and neutral as social forces."

¹⁶*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 30-31.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 594-595.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 828-829.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, IV, iii, 25.

²⁰*King Lear*, edited by William L. Phelps, 1929. Act I, ii, 140-141.

²¹*Ibid.*, I, ii, 131.

²²*Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished, Mythologiz'd, And Represented in Figures*. By George Sandys, 1632, p. 376.

²³*The Odysseys of Homer*, translated by George Chapman, edited by Rev. Richard Hooper, 1897, VI, II, p. 160.

²⁴Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VIII, 739-740.

²⁵*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 11-12.

²⁶E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, 1930, Vol. 1, p. 490.

²⁷Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds*, 1913, p. 32.

²⁸T. Macci Plauti *Comœdiæ*, recognovit W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, n. d., *Bacchides*, line 275.

²⁹Martial, *Epigrams*, VIII, lix, 1-2.

³⁰E. g., the edition of Georgius Alexandrinus, Venice, 1510, pp. XC 1ecto and verso.

³¹*Natalis Comitis Mythologiae, sive Explicationis Fabularum, Esbri Decem*, Frankfurt, 1596.

³²*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 829.

³³Memoriae prodidit Zezes hist. 202 chil. 8. Autolycum Laertae patrem, qui fuit avus Vlyssis, omnium prope mortalium pauperrimum artem furandi a Mercurio didicisse, quare ditissimus postea euasit. auunt hunc tam peritum fuisse latronem, ut cum optimum equum furatus esset, asinum scabie corrosus pro illo restituent, effeceritque ut eum recipientes minime id sentirent. Conti, *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

³⁴ . . . atque cum alteri pulcherrimam sponsam rapuisset, anum edentulam, muscosam, & larvam prope restituent. atque in commutandis mercibus eandem seruabat rationem: nam, fuerunt qui praestigiatorum artem a Mercurio excogitam dixerint. Conti, *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

³⁵Hunc astutissimum omnium mortalium fuisse memorant: quippe cum Autolyci sua tempestate insignis & nobilis latronis, qui non solum iurciurando, sed etiam praestigiis ita ita homines decipiebat, ut alias res pro aliis caparent, fallacias repulerit. Cum enim greges Sisyphei, qui tunc imperabat Corinthi, Autolycus aliquando occultasset, illosque mutatos reddere conaretur, frustra id egit: quoniam his gregibus Sisyphus suum nomen sub vngulis una litera contentum inusserat. Id ubi vidisset Autolycus, amicitiam contraxit cum Sisypheo, atque illi Anticleam filiem in matrimonium dedit; ex quibus nata est filia eiusdem nominis, quam Laertes pater Vlyssis postea uxorem duxit. Conti, *Op. cit.*, p. 629.

³⁶*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 673-674

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "TIMON OF ATHENS"

By RALPH A. HAUG

OF the perplexities that have beset students of Shakspeare, few have been more puzzling than those presented by *Timon of Athens*. Heminge and Condell printed it as the fourth of the tragedies, and this, so far as is known, was the first time the play was published. No record has survived of any contemporary stage presentation, although the Folio text bears some evidence of having been printed from an acting version.

Some of the more important problems in *Timon* are these: Did Shakspeare write a part of the play or all of it? Is there another hand present in its composition? If there is, whose hand was it, and was the work of the other writer done before or after that of Shakspeare? These questions are fundamental. Other problems are the date of composition, the sources of the play, and its obvious, often glaring, mistakes in construction. These problems, to echo Dr. Wright, "present a collection of enigmas as perplexing and as numerous as any play in the Shakespeare canon offers."¹

Of the theories of dual authorship, the earliest suggestion is that made by Charles Knight, in his *Pictorial Edition* (1838). He argued that Shakspeare re-wrote part of an older play by a very inferior dramatist. The weightiest early work for this theory is that of Nikolaus Delius in "Ueber Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*"² (1867). The other side of the question, that an inferior hand has worked over materials at least partly written by Shakspeare, was discussed by G. C. Verplanck in 1847 and Benno Tschischwitz in 1869, but the first important modern work was that of F. G. Fleay, whose paper, "On the Authorship of *Timon of Athens*," was read to the New Shakespeare Society in 1874.³

Fleay states as his thesis: "The object of the present paper is to shew that the nucleus, the original and only valuable part of the play, is Shakespeare's, and that it was completed for the stage by a second and inferior hand." (p. 130). He opens his paper with a discussion of what is authentic Shaksperian material and what is not. He follows for the most part the esthetic method of judging; that is, by ear. Now

and then he argues by logical elimination to show that two hands must be responsible for errors: for instance, he urges that I, ii, with its confusion of servants and Athenian lords with similar names; and V, iii, in which a soldier, who cannot read, reads an epitaph from a monument, and then takes a rubbing of the verses, are non-Shaksperian errors. The authentic part of *Timon*, Fleay says, was written in 1606,⁴ but was not completed. Later this part was used, together with a good deal of bombast, short line verse, defective prose, and rapid dialogue, to fill up 21 pages in the Folio left vacant by the removal of *Troilus and Cressida* to the end of the section of histories. Fleay goes on to ascribe the inferior work to Cyril Tourneur, because he sees a slight resemblance between the inferior passages and *The Revenger's Tragedy* of 1607, but he does not press the point.

Deighton⁵ follows much the same reasoning as Fleay, differing on several minor points, mainly the identity of the interpolator. Of him Deighton says: "To me, such work looks like that of some player to whom the editors, failing to find portions known once to have existed, had entrusted the task of putting together the incomplete materials, perhaps . . . made up from actors' copies."

The most lengthy and ingenious work is that of Dr. E. H. Wright, who published his dissertation, *The Authorship of Timon of Athens*, in 1910. Though differing from Fleay, mostly in minor details, his conclusions are the same: "Unless our reasoning is wrong, the singularities and inconsistencies we noted in the play when starting are the product of a man of small ability, writing probably in haste, and seemingly without an intimate acquaintance with the play he was augmenting, or at least without good judgment of its needs. . . . Shakespeare was the first writer to touch the play."⁶

The veteran student, J. M. Robertson, attacked the matter in 1917 in his *Shakespeare and Chapman*. He says (p. 128) by way of introduction: "But if we conceive Shakspeare to have imperfectly recast a faulty play by Chapman, whether or not a third hand meddled later, 'the case is altered,'" and states as his conclusion: "Ill-motivated, ill-plotted, ill-constructed, it [*Timon*] is not such a drama as Shakespeare would have schemed in his maturity. Con-

sidered as an imperfect revision by him of one imperfectly drafted by Chapman, to whom the theme would especially appeal, it becomes newly and completely intelligible" (p. 180).

Robertson, then, goes back to the earliest hypothesis of an inferior play patched up by Shakspeare.

Professor T. M. Parrott combines the theories of Robertson and Fleay and his followers. He accepts the "inferior hand" as that of Chapman, but places him second, as the playwright who patched up Shakspeare's unfinished work. After his efforts on *Lear* and *Othello* Shakspeare was not able to give his best, and, after he had "marked out the way to success and was proceeding along true dramatic lines"⁷ he laid the work aside. Later on, perhaps, Professor Parrott thinks, about 1616, the draft was handed to Chapman to revise for a fee. He did not take his task very seriously, and turned in an unplayable mess. This was revised by still a third hand—perhaps someone in the company—and the result was probably at least tried on the stage, but was unsuccessful. This version was given to the Folio printers as copy.

Another theory of the "other hand" is proposed by Mr. H. D. Sykes, who goes back to the older theory, holding that Shakspeare worked over an earlier play. Mr. Sykes finds "plain evidence that two authors were concerned in the original play, which Shakespeare revised."⁸ The collaborators of the original play were, Mr. Sykes says, John Day and Thomas Middleton. Mr. Dixon Wecter⁹ believes that Shakspeare wrote a complete *Timon* play, but was so politically inept as to make it refer glaringly to the evil fortunes of the Earl of Essex. His friends, therefore, had to chop it up and re-write it to make it innocuous, since Shakspeare himself was too busy with *Macbeth*. Thus Essex is *Timon*; Bacon is *Ventidius*; his friends are the ungrateful Athenians.

Thus we have a number of theories. Fleay, Dr. Wright, and Mr. Deighton follow one line; Mr. Robertson an entirely different track; and Professor Parrott, in reconciling the theories, has added still a third hand, that of an adapter.

Mr. Sykes is able to find two earlier workers who had fingers in the pie. One fact is obvious—there is little agreement among the revisionists, obviously because they cannot agree on their major premises. If one is right, the others must be wrong.

E. K. Chambers makes the latest suggestion (though it is not new, of course), and the one which, in the light of all this disagreement, seems to me the best. Sir Edmund says: "None of the theories seem convincing to me in detail, and their very multiplicity suggests that their exponents are on the wrong tack. Moreover, most of these are compelled to admit that the revision, by whomsoever accomplished, was itself blundering and incomplete. . . . I do not doubt that it was left unfinished by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of the 'problem,' indicated long ago by Ulrici and others, is that it is unfinished still."¹⁰

It is on this theory, arrived at after a study of the play and the critical evidences presented by holders of all viewpoints, that the arguments of this paper are to be based.

The first of the critics to be discussed may well be Mr. Robertson, since his approach is unique. The others have discussed the validity of the play scene by scene, testing it both esthetically and logically. Mr. Robertson applies the vocabulary test, with odd results. He lists 107 words which appear only in *Timon*, or else in only one or two other plays, usually late ones. I shall give here only the words which are unique in *Timon*. A large number of them occur in Chapman, many of them frequently, Mr. Robertson says, and there is no reason to dispute his assertion. The words are: untirable, confluence, beneath (adj.), glass-faced, propagate, scope, sacrificial, period (verb), unclaw, unpeaceable, apperil, dich ("much good dich thy good heart"), sweep (noun), jutting, reliances, dialogue (verb), detention, unaptness, spilth, caked, ingeniously (ingenuously), respectively, solidares, recoverable, outsides, repugnancy, usuring, dividant, rother, fang (verb), wappened, spices (verb), voiced, penurious, trenchant, exhaust, mountant, oathable, hoar (verb), grave (bury), unmeasurable, ensear, conception, marbled, liquorish, greases, carper, hinge (verb), approachers, castigate, enforcedly, confectionary, mast

(acorns), composture, exceptless, softness, opulency, patchery (roguery), cauterizing, racanter,¹¹ sorrow'd, whittle, fragile, traversed, decimation, rampired, regular, insculpature.

At the end of this list, Mr. Robertson remarks: "It is needless to stress the point that seventy words peculiar to one play in the concordance, and thirty to one scene, constitute proof of an alien presence."¹² That such a statement could be made by a critic of Mr. Robertson's scholarly background is almost incredible. Every play of Shakspeare has scores of words never used elsewhere: 72 in the early *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and 410 in *Hamlet*. *Timon* itself has not 107, but 166 "onecers," with 31 new compounds. Furthermore, on consulting the *New English Dictionary* I found to be true what anyone might have expected from a glance at the list given above. Most of the words were used, and used frequently, from 1550 to 1650. Only eighteen were found to be really uncommon. These are: beneath (adj.), caked, conception, hinge (verb), liquorish, oathable, opulency, reliances, scope, sacrificial, spilth, solidares, sweep (noun), and wappened. Other writers used several of these words as different parts of speech. The words "solidares" and "spilth" are probably coinages. It seems to me that the vocabulary test, on which Mr. Robertson bases most of his argument, is invalid. The presence of Chapman's work in the play has not, of course, been disproved, but has been reduced to a mere assertion.

The other critics of *Timon* have discussed the play scene by scene, attributing this to Shakspeare, that to the other playwrights, according to esthetic and logical analysis. In the succeeding pages I shall examine a few scenes, sample the work in them, and try to demonstrate my thesis. Scenes which by common consent are attributed to Shakspeare may be ignored.

A glance at the list of parts attributed to Shakspeare will show that most critics, with the exception of Professor Parrott, give by far the greater share of the first scene to him. It is in the second scene of Act I that we first encounter real difficulties. We find here long lines which will not scan; short lines which neither scan nor fit in with

others; prose breaking into verse sixteen times; wretched couplets of doggerel; and dramatic mistakes a-plenty. Yet there are definite Shaksperian touches throughout. Consider the opening lines:

Most honored Timon,
It hath pleased the gods to remember my father's age
And call him to long peace. (I, ii, 1-3).

The scansion is rough, yet the sound of these lines is Shakspeare's. It seems fair to suggest that the idea of the lines is here set down, the scansion to be worked out completely later.

None of the critics who do not allow him the entire play ascribes any part of this scene to Shakspeare. When we come to lines like these, we begin to wonder:

I scorn thy meat; 'T would choke me, for I should ne'er flatter thee. O you gods, what a number of men eats Timon and he sees 'em not. It grieves me to see so many dip their meat in one man's blood; and all the madness is, he cheers them up too.
I wonder men dare trust themselves with men
Methinks they should invite them without knives;
Good for their meat, and safer for their lives. (I, ii, 38-46).

This, of course, is Apemantus speaking, and this cynical butt may be permitted to talk this way. But a few lines later Timon, who in the first scene had spoken winged words, gives this sermon:

O, no doubt, my good friends, but the Gods themselves have provided that I shall have much help from you; how had you been my friends else? Why have you that charitable title from thousands, did you not chiefly belong to my heart? I have told more of you to myself than you can with modesty speak in your own behalf; and thus far I confirm you O you Gods, think I, what need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of 'em? They were the most needless creatures living should we ne'er have use for 'em, and would most resemble sweet instruments hung up in cases that keep their sounds to themselves. (I, ii, 90-103).

The masque in this scene has been criticized. "This is tragedy," critics say. "A masque has its place in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or *The Tempest*, but not here in a tragedy of hate." But, as Professor Knight has noted,¹⁸ this early part of Timon's existence is filled with wealth, joy, luxury. He is the dispenser of happiness to everyone.

And in no way could this idea be better staged than by a masque. Professor Parrott (p. 10) notes that Chapman was fond of introducing masques. He cannot have forgotten that Shakspeare likewise used them.

The verse of the scene is most irregular. Sometimes it seems to have the true note of Shakspeare:

I take all and your several visitations
So kind to heart, 'tis not enough to give;
Methinks I could deal kingdoms to my friends
And ne'er be weary. Alcibiades,
Thou art a soldier, therefore seldom rich. (I, ii, 226-230).

But then we come upon other lines like these:

His promises fly so beyond his state
That what he speaks is all in debt; he owes
For every word; he is so kind that he now
Pays interest for't; his land's put to their books
(I, ii, 204-207).

or like these

But yond man is ever angry.
Go, let him have a table by himself,
For he does neither affect company
Nor is he fit for it, indeed.
(I, ii, 29-32).

We do not know Shakspeare's methods of composition. But it is impossible to believe that he turned out his work literally never "blotting a line." Surely there must have been much toil and sweat of the study. As has been said above, what I suggest for this scene, and for all the "imperfect" scenes of the play, is that we have here a rough draft, the first sketch of a drama, in which some parts are complete, some in a state approaching completion, and others in a chaotic condition. Such an hypothesis would explain short lines—the idea is there, but the words were tardy; it explains long lines—the ideas were clothed in too many words; it explains chaotic passages as rough notes that could be worked over later into a finished scene; and it explains the frequent dramatic mistakes that have led many critics to see the hand of an adapter.

Mr. Wright (p. 57) gives a verse analysis of the scene. He finds that feminine endings are 15 percent, whereas the

true "Shaksperian" part of *Timon* has 22 percent; run-on lines, 12 percent, "Shaksperian," 27 percent; rimes, 21 percent, against 4 per cent. In scattered bits like these the verse test does not seem to have much significance. For one thing, we do not know the exact date of the play, and Shakspeare's metre varied in different periods of his career; and, furthermore, he was not bound to any metrical system at any time.

The many errors in the scene have been used to prove dual authorship. But anyone who would be employed to revise the play would be a man of the theatre. Chapman, Tourneur, Day, Middleton were skillful dramatists. I cannot see that they would be more likely than Shakspeare to make a number of little mistakes, either as original authors or revisers. And if Mr. Robertson is correct, and Shakspeare revised this work of Chapman, he surely would give little evidence of having learned much about the construction of plays in his fifteen years in the theatre had he turned in the play as it is. On the basis of the mistakes, the revision theory would leave one or both who had a part in the play miserable bunglers; a theory that *Timon* is an unrevised first draft leaves no one responsible, since we may feel sure that they would have been eliminated in revision.

What are these errors? Ventidius (Ventigius, sometimes, in the Folio) who had been released from jail, becomes an heir on the death of his father and comes to Timon's banquet—all this in about fifteen minutes (I,ii,1-7). This is an error that a writer might easily make with a minor character, but one which a reviser would pounce upon at once. The steward is called Flavius here, but that is evidently not his name (I, ii, 162). (The Folio here calls him *Flavius*, but later *Stew.*). A servant announces senators to the feast, but the senators do not come in (line 180). Timon says that he plans to make a gift to Alcibiades, but nothing more is heard of it (line 227). It seems much more plausible that these are the errors of the author, working rapidly, rather than the work of a reviser.

Act II, scene i, is, by everybody, save Mr. Robertson, who sees a Chapman base, considered to be Shakspeare's. No special pleading is necessary. The whole scene is compact;

the plot, which rather lagged through the first act, begins to tighten; and the verse has the terse, swift-moving quality of Shakspeare's narrative. Furthermore, the scene scans, has little rhyme, and fulfills, according to Mr. Wright, all the requirements of good Shaksperian verse.

How shall we reconcile this excellent verse with the halting patchwork scene which precedes? I believe the reason for its finished state is in the fact that the plot definitely tightens here. Timon's fortune, built on lavishness, is about to collapse. It is a key place in the drama. In casting up his play, Shakspeare first completed these necessary scenes. Perhaps these were parts he saw most clearly.

Lines 1-46 of the second scene need not concern us. Even Professor Parrott ascribes the scene to Shakspeare. The next section, lines 47-131, has been invariably ascribed to the other hand and merits examination.

The passage, in prose, is a flyting match between Apemantus and various servants. The prose here is not fragmentary—one cannot call it notes or jottings. But it is hasty. The inevitable error is there. Two letters are brought in by a page, one to Timon and one to Alcibiades, from a whore; Shakspeare probably meant to do something with them, but forgot. The later association of Timon and Alcibiades is significant. The other errors are slight, but that of the letters is important. A reviser or interpolator would have no possible point in introducing them, since he was not making the plot. The rest of the scene is usually called Shakspeare's; Dr. Wright excepts line 192. A single sample will show the authentic ring:

So the Gods bless me,
When all our offices have been oppress'd
With riorous feeders, when our vaults have wept
With drunken spilth of wine, when every room
Hath blaz'd with lights, and bray'd with minstrelsy,
I have retir'd me to a wasteful cock
And set mine eyes at flow. (II, ii, 162-168).

The plot moves forward rapidly in this part of the scene. Timon is apprized of his ruin, but he is still confident, sure that his friends will help him.

The first three scenes of Act III produce good evidence

of the trouble to which following a theory too closely will lead. Fleay and some others have ascribed the following lines in II, ii (excellent narrative prose, quite worthy of Shakspeare) to the reviser:

Tim. I will dispatch you severally. You to Lord Lucius, to Lord Lucullus you, I hunted with his honor today; you to Sempronius; commend me to their loves; and I am proud, say, that my occasions have found time to use 'em toward a supply of money; let the request be fifty talents. (II, ii, 196-202).

Therefore, the results of these lines—the scenes in which Timon's requests for loans are refused—must be the reviser's work as well; Shakspeare could not have written one without writing the other. These scenes are excellent in characterization and dialogue, vastly better than some of the other condemned sections.

In III, ii, 29-41 we have an example of what must surely be hasty, incomplete writing. Timon's servant, Servilius, asks Lord Lucius for "so many talents" (line 39) and Lucius retorts: "He cannot want fifty five hundred talents." Had the reviser written the order to the servants to get fifty talents, he would surely have remembered it, for it was he, say the critics, who had only shortly before written the lines quoted above. The "so many" sounds like words put in until the exact amount could be checked. Similarly with "fifty five hundred talents"—a sum amounting to over a million pounds. I believe that the two amounts "50" and "500" were put down in Shakspeare's manuscript, until one could be checked and crossed out. As the play was never finished, this was never done.

Of the fourth scene, Dr. Wright has this to say (p. 43):

"There is little need, if any, for a second dunning scene in the play. It is therefore likely, *a priori*, that the superfluous scene, repeating one of Shakespeare's, is the other authors." [The other dunning scene had been II, ii, 50ff.]

No doubt Timon's utter ruin could have been shown otherwise. But the scene serves at least three important dramatic purposes: first, it shows the hypocrisy of the fair-weather friends by contrasting them with their servants, who are honester men than they; second, it introduces Timon in his rage, his *saeva indignatio* (it is the first time

he is seen after his ruin) ; third, the invitation to the mock-banquet is given here. If only one dunning scene is held necessary, why not only one love scene in *Romeo and Juliet*? or why waste space in an over-long play with more than one scene showing Hamlet's hesitation?¹⁴

Mr. Wright brands (p. 43) much of the verse in this scene as "positively silly," and, when not quite that, the "style is mediocre." This he must apply to such lines as these:

'Tis deepest winter in Lord Timon's purse;
That is, one may reach deep enough, and yet
Find little. (III, iv, 14-16).

and to

What, are my doors oppos'd against my passage?
Have I been ever free, and must my house
Be my retentive enemy, my gaol?
The place which I have feasted, does it now,
Like all mankind, show me an iron heart?
(III, iv, 80-84).

But it is perhaps unfair to quote only the best of the scene. There is not much of this nobler verse here—the action precludes it; we have no right to look for great poetry in a dunning scene. For the most part, the scene is the rapid talk of the servants. Let us note some of it:

Phil. Good day at once.
Luci. Welcome good brother.
What do you think of the hour?
Phil. Laboring for nine.
Luci. So much?
Phil. Is not my lord seen yet? (III, iv, 7-10).

This terse, clear dialogue serves the purpose of showing Timon's concealment—his actual hiding—from his creditors. The faithful steward's¹⁵ speech, likewise, certainly is not contemptible:

Why then preferred you not your sums and bills
When your false masters eat of my lord's meat?
Then they could smile, and fawn upon his debts,
And take down th' interest into their glutt'nous maws.
(III, iv, 48-51).

The entire scene, rejected by the critics, is dramatically necessary, a development of the characters of Timon and

the steward, and is not beneath the admiration of fair criticism. It is most surely not "contemptible" and "ragged."

III, v, is rejected by all the critics, Chapman of course being the candidate of Professor Parrott and Mr. Robertson, the others choosing the "unknown hand." To get Alcibiades banished from Athens, to make him an enemy of the state, he is depicted defending an unknown friend for an unknown crime. Mercy being denied, Alcibiades is himself banished.

The only dramatic weakness of the scene is its surprise. Since there is no connection with what has gone before, we are not ready for it. But a motivation of Alcibiades' later hatred of Athens is necessary to the plot:

Banishment!

It comes not ill, I hate not to be banished,
It is a cause worthy my spleen and fury,
That I may strike at Athens. (III, v, 112-115).

The verse of the scene, "mediocre," Mr. Wright calls it, is not so contemptible as he thinks. The opening address of Alcibiades to the senate:

I am an humble suitor to your virtues;
For pity is the virtue of the law,
And none but tyrants use it cruelly. (III, v, 6-8).

has at least some of the feeling of Othello's great speech to another senate. And the rest of the verse throughout the scene has the same note of dignity and high-mindedness. There are some irregularities, particularly short lines. Professor Parrott cites them as examples of cutting, but these short lines fit the context perfectly. Either extraordinary care was used in cutting, or there was none. In the irregular lines Mr. Wright sees the inferior hand. Let us examine a few of them: "He did oppose his foe" (l. 20).

Is it impossible to consider this a first draft, a note of the thought, which could be expanded later?

To bring manslaughter into form, and set quarrelling
Upon the head of valour. (ll.27-28).

In its context, these lines are clear enough. They seem another rough draft.

To kill, I grant, is sin's extremest gust,
 But in defense, by Mercy, 'tis most just.
 To be in anger, is impiety;
 But who is man, that is not angry? (II. 55-58).

No one would call these lines the finished work of Shakspeare. They are not necessarily chaotic—they are simply rough jottings unfinished. The argument that says the best and worst lines of this scene are both the completed work of one man does not seem tenable. As in any piece of work left unfinished, some parts are much better done than others.

All critics unite in giving the best of III, vi, 93-110, to Shakspeare, even though the end of the scene has two couplets. Mr. Wright would not assign to Shakspeare the scene in which the guests were invited, but ascribes this later scene to him on the ground that he wrote the scene in which the two guests, "obviously Lucullus and Lucius," turned Timon's servants down. (Mr. Wright has been one of the few to ascribe the rejection scenes to Shakspeare.) We need not go into the scene. It is the climax of the play; it has some excellent invective, the prose is somewhat better than that of, say, I, ii, and the verse gives no indication of incompleteness.

No question has been raised over IV, i. The curse of Timon on Athens is like that of Lear for Goneril, though Timon's is longer and more circumstantial. A few lines will show its quality:

Lust and liberty
 Creep in the minds and marrows of our youth,
 That 'gainst the stream of virtue they may strive,
 And drown themselves in riot! Itches, blains,
 Sow all the Athenian bosoms, and their crop
 Be general leprosy. (IV, i, 25-30).

Fleay and Rolfe deny Shakspeare any part of IV, ii, although Mr. Wright and Professor Parrott agree that, at least for the first thirty lines, its authorship has not been doubted. The first part is the affecting leave-taking of the servants—perhaps the most moving lines in the play. The concluding twenty-one form a sententious monologue for the steward. There are several short lines.

Sententious verse in couplets does not sound well to the modern ear. But the Elizabethans had not passed through a reaction against moralizing—they approved it heartily. Shakspeare used couplets in many of his later plays, not considering, of course, the couplets concluding speeches or scenes. Compare *Lear*, I, i, 183-190, I, ii, 257-267, III, vi, 110-120 (Q1), V, iii, 319-326; and *Othello*, I, iii, 201-220, and II, i, 149-160. Each of these passages is very similar to the one in *Timon* in purpose—sententious self-communion. It is obvious, then, that the fact of the couplets proves nothing against our case. Shakspeare used them; so did his fellows. There is a clue in this passage to the significance of the short lines: none of them rhyme, though many of the full lines do. If they were not meant to stand as they are, and I believe they were not, the lack of rhymes among them points to hasty writing. The unrhyming lines (in the passages from *Lear* and *Othello*, all the lines are couplets) in *Timon* may indicate hasty writing at a time when the rhymes did not come readily.

In the third scene the critics have been very ingenious in patching up a kind of Chinese puzzle of ascriptions. None has chopped it up in quite the same way; Professor Parrott has been the most successful: he has broken it into seven pieces, ascribing them to Shakspeare, Chapman, and the unknown reviser, on much the same evidence as the others. There is nothing in the scene that illustrates anything new, so we need not discuss it at any length. The delayed entrance of the poet and the painter has been laid to the reviser, and made much of. But it may mean only a slip of the memory. It will be remembered that, in line 337, Apemantus announces their arrival, but they do not enter until some two hundred lines have been spoken, the banditti and the steward entering meanwhile. A reviser would have pounced upon such an error; Shakspeare simply changed his mind as he went along, and never returned to correct his mistake.

Act five has the surest evidence of hasty work found in the play. An illiterate soldier has taken a wax impression of the inscription on Timon's tomb, and presents it to Alcibiades to read. The inscription is:

Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft;

Seek not my name. A plague consume you wicked caitiffs left.
Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate;
Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here thy gait.
(V, iv, 70-73).

This, of course, is really two contrasting epitaphs, copied almost verbatim from North's *Plutarch*. What happened seems obvious. Shakspeare noted both down, intending later to delete one. Shakspeare never returned to *Timon*, hence both epitaphs remain. That a reviser would have gone to the trouble of seeking out another epitaph is impossible.

There is one scene in act five that saddens anyone loyal to the Shaksperian authorship theory. The third scene cannot be called unfinished, for the lines are regular enough. Its utter flatness reminds us that Shakspeare could, sometimes, write very badly. I shall quote a few lines from it (it is only ten lines long).

By all description this should be the place.
Who's here? speak, ho! No answer! What is this?
Timon is dead, who hath outstretch'd his span.
Some beast read this? there does not live a man.
Dead, sure, and this his grave. What's on this tomb?
I cannot read; the character I'll take with wax.
(V, iii, 1-6).

The lines are all end-stopped but one; the concluding couplet is very bad. However, this is merely a short "functional" scene; it carries on a necessary action of the play, and it was meant to do no more. Furthermore, only an illiterate soldier is talking; there was no reason why he should speak winged words.

There is, of course, no absolute proof possible in such a discussion as this. I think it can be definitely shown that Mr. Robertson's "proof" of Chapman's hand is nonsense, but we have not ruled Chapman out—merely made him improbable. On purely esthetic grounds it would be pleasant to agree with Fleay and his followers, but such critical softness would lead to all kinds of monstrosities. It seems fair to say that the following ideas about *Timon of Athens* may be based on truth:

Part of the verse in the play seems to be a hasty jotting of ideas mixed with lines which may or may not be finished. (It is not, of course, taken for granted that a verse is in its complete, final form simply because it has ten syllables and

scans.) A few examples of unfinished verse, taken from the parts called non-Shaksperian, will recapitulate this idea:

Heyday,
 What a sweep of vanity comes this way.
 They dance? They are mad women.
 Like madness is the glory of this life,
 As this pomp shews to a little oil and root.
 We make ourselves fools to disport ourselves,
 And spend our flatteries, to drink those men
 Upon whose age we void it up again.
 (I, ii, 134-141).

The speech is sententious, and was probably intended to rhyme throughout. The lines are extraordinarily obscure, as they might well be if they were mere notes of the meaning, to be completed later.¹⁶

Another example, to the same effect:

This was my lord's best hope; now all are fled,
 Save the Gods only. Now his friends are dead,
 Doors, that were ne'er acquainted with their wards
 Many a bounteous year, must be employ'd
 Now to guard their master:
 And this is all a liberal course allows,
 Who cannot keep his wealth must keep his house
 (III, iii, 36-42).

Here the short line, in the midst of a sententious passage, is almost certainly a note, which later revision was to expand, and, perhaps, another line was to be inserted. The numerous passages in *Lear*, for example, prove beyond question Shakspeare's use of this form for moralizing.

The second great objection of the critics is that the prose is bad—Fleay rejects every word of it. Prose, of course, must be judged on esthetic and dramatic lines. Let us look at a few passages of the part usually rejected: first, the speech of the fool:

I think no usurer but has a fool to his servant. my mistress is one, and I am her fool. When men come to borrow of your masters, they approach sadly, and go away merry; but they enter my mistress' house merrily, and go away sadly. (II, ii, 101-105).

This is terse, crisp prose. We cannot prove that Shakspeare wrote it, but there is no reason for thinking that he did not. Similarly:

If thou wert the lion, the fox would beguile thee, if thou wert the

lamb, the fox would eat thee; if thou wert the fox, the lion would suspect thee, etc. (IV, iii, 325-29).

It is hard to dogmatize about prose, although most of the critics do. But though Mr. Wright calls the scene from which the above lines are taken "vaudeville," and Professor Parrott calls it a *faux pas*, I cannot see in them anything save Shakspeare at something less than his best.

The third important reason for suspecting the presence of a reviser has been the mistakes, all of them errors of no great importance, and obvious on careful reading. As I pointed out before, these errors seem a stronger proof of hasty writing than of anything else. Of course, a mistake is much more obvious in the study than on the stage, and Shakspeare was seldom careful to keep his work free from small blunders.

Mistakes due to haste are probably such errors as the following: that of Ventidius (I, ii, 1-8); the names of the servants, Flavius, the steward, and Flaminius; the delayed entrance of the poet and painter; the "fifty five hundred talents" (III, ii, 41); and the double epitaph (V, iv, 70-73). An error which seems to indicate a forgotten intention is that of the letters of the whore to Timon and Alcibiades (II, ii, 85-90) since they may connect with the venereal disease speeches later. The same may be true of the lack of a denial scene with Ventidius.

Where the verse (and sometimes the prose) is excellent, finished, clear, there is no question of its authorship, and where the verse halts and the prose is dull the critics see another hand at work. It would be good to believe that the "greatest and most comprehensive soul" never writ badly, and that, whenever there is a part we do not like, it is a corruption, the work of an adapter or reviser or prompter or printer. But such bardolatry, which led Coleridge to reject the Porter scene because he did not like it, is dangerous. Sir Edmund Chambers says (p. 207): "The folio must be regarded as the chief authority for the main range of Shakspeare . . . and it requires deference as coming from men who were in the best position to know the facts. A desire to do justice to a dead 'fellow' and some care taken in the work are apparent enough in the epistles." Shak-

spere's old colleagues were honest men, honestly trying to honor his memory. They did, it is true, include *Henry VIII*, which shows the work of another hand. But the student must not accept this as the basis for an *a priori* assumption in dealing with any play which, like *Timon*, has parts open to suspicion. He must accept the Folio as presumptive evidence that the plays are Shakspeare's until the contrary has been proved. He must not take the inclusion of other men's work here and there as a basis for a general suspicion of the canon.

The final objection to the critics is on esthetic grounds. From the time of Fleay the custom in criticizing the play has been that followed in the first part of this paper—breaking it up into parts and judging on the basis of fragments. But such an approach misses the most vital point about a play—that the whole is greater than the parts, and that if Shakspeare discarded the classical unities, there was unity of tone, of design, of effect in his plays, the only kind of unity that matters. If this unity is not present in our play, there may be genuine reason to doubt its authorship; if it is present, it is almost impossible to see how there can be two hands working on it.

Timon of Athens is called by Professor Knight "The Pilgrimage of Hate." From a lord of golden kindness and benevolence, he is plunged into such loathing, such hatred of all human kind, as is found in no other of Shakspeare's plays. His hatred is not aimed at individuals, it is universal. The hate is carried through, growing in intensity. In *Lear* the good triumphs in death. For the old man, the last horror of Cordelia's death endured, death is a kindly deliverance:

Vex not his ghost: O, let him pass! He hates him much
That would upon the rack of this tough world
Stretch him out longer. (*Lear*, V, iii, 313-315)

The evil people, hoist on their own petard, are destroyed by their sins. So it is in *Macbeth* and *Othello* and *Hamlet*, each in its degree. But in *Timon* we have no interest in the punishment of the treacherous friends. All our interest is centered upon Timon and his hate. Ulrici is correct when he says: "His character, although by no means unnatural, is, nevertheless, of such an unusual type, such a mere ex-

ception to the rule, that he cannot excite us to any personal sympathy."¹⁷ He has summed up the bitter tragedy of the play: "Even in *Macbeth* the conciliatory element of tragedy, the mild splendour of the setting sun, such as spread over Romeo's, Lear's, and Hamlet's death, is removed far into the background. . . . The shadows continue to become deeper, 'till finally in *Timon of Athens* we have the full darkness of night" (p. 531).

So all our attention is centered, then, upon this "pilgrimage" of Timon, from the point where he says:

You mistake my love;
I gave it freely ever; and there's none
Can truly say he gives, if he receives;
If our betters play at that game, we must not dare
To imitate them; faults that are rich are fair.
(I, ii, 9-13).

until, in the very ecstasy of hate, he bids the whores:

Consumptions sow
In hollow bones of man; strike their sharp shins,
And mar men's spurring. Crack the lawyers voice
That he may never more false title plead,
Nor sound his quilllets shrilly; hoar the flamen
That scolds against the quality of flesh
And not believes himself: down with the nose,
Down with it flat; take the bridge quite away
Of him that, his particulars to foresee
Smells from the general weal. (IV, iii, 150-158).

and so to the end:

Come not to me again, but say to Athens,
Timon hath made his everlasting mansion
Upon the beached verge of the salt flood;
Who once a day with his embossed froth
The turbulent surge shall cover: thither come,
And let my gravestone be your oracle.
Lips, let sour words go by and language end:
What is amiss plague and infection mend!
Graves only be men's works and death their gain!
Sun, hide thy beams! Timon hath done his reign.
(V, i, 217-226).

Critics have considered the motivation in *Timon* insufficient. What they miss is that Shakspeare made his motives to suit his people—Hamlet a murdered father and strumpeted mother, Othello a handkerchief, and a villian's innu-

endoes; Coriolanus the loss of the consulship, Lear the ungratefulness of children. To Timon, who had lived in a universe of love, the shattering realization that there was no love was motive enough.

There is unity of effect, secured through the progress of the character of Timon. There is little progress through action. Compared with the action of *Lear*, with which it is closest allied, *Timon* is rather static. Though it is a tragedy, no one is killed; Timon dies a natural death. It is thus a tragedy of mood and character, not one of action.

Do the scenes called "spurious" add to this mood, retard it, or simply ignore it? What is their relation to the plot? If it can be shown, in a few disputed scenes, that they fit both, another strong supposition of Shakspeare's authorship will have been established.

A good share of I, i, has been denied Shakspeare by Professor Parrott, Mr. Robertson and others. The scene introduces Timon by having him described by his admirers. *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar* begin in much the same way. The affluent, genial Timon is shown in benevolent action, and Apemantus, the professional cynic, is brought in. He is rough, crude, vulgar—but how else could he be? This is Shakspeare's concept of him. Furthermore, the scene is evidently planned to introduce every character of any importance,—they all make their appearance here.

The second scene is always rejected. It develops the character of Timon, further contrasts him with Apemantus, and, by his largesse, prepares us for the ingratitude to come. The tone of richness and happiness is heightened by the masque. When Mr. Wright (p. 36) calls this scene "dead waste" he forgets that the design of the play has been started and that this scene is the foundation of all that is to come. The effect of gold, effortless luxury, has been achieved.

The second act begins the awakening of Timon. His creditors begin to draw in on him. Most have recognized that this part of the plot must be by Shakspeare, but they are horrified again at Apemantus. They have missed Shakspeare's idea of him as boorish, obscene, and dirty. The speeches of Apemantus throughout are in keeping with his character.

The third act gives the rejection of Timon by his friends. This section, the motive of Timon's hatred, the climax of the play, is denied to Shakspeare—because the servants are not differentiated. Furnivall saw clearly that the rejection scenes must belong to Shakspeare: "I cannot believe that Shakspeare would make the ingratitude of one man [Ventidius] the sole cause of Timon's entire change of character."¹⁸ If the first three scenes of this act are rejected, we are forced to assume that Shakspeare gives us Timon in his rage without showing us why; that he never troubled to show us why Timon had such soul-shaking hatred.

"There is little need, if any, for a second dunning scene in the play," says Dr. Wright (p. 43). Therefore the fourth scene of the third act is discarded. This is to say, there is no need for us to know Timon's utter ruin, no need for us to see, for the first time, his *saeva indignatio*, no need for the invitation to the mock banquet. The tone has changed, has grown into harshness and cruelty. No need to develop this effect for what is to come?

I do not greatly admire the banishment scene of Alcibiades. But it is in the mood of the play. As Knight says (pp.235-36): "It suggests that Athens is suffering from an ingrateful and effete generation, greedy and mean." And "The theme of Alcibiades is closely woven with that of Timon, and both endure ingratitude from the senate." Ingratitude, and hate springing from it, is the theme of Alcibiades as well as Timon.

From this point the argument may be merely sketched. The mock banquet, with its fine climax, "Uncover, dogs, and lap," is of course necessary to establish the final, complete loathing of Timon for his kind. In the scene of the parting of the servants there is a contrasting touch of human love, which is touching. From the banquet Timon's hatred grows blacker. He finds gold, but it pleases him no more, save as an instrument of evil. For Alcibiades, the whores, Apemantus, his old parasites, the bandits, his hate grows deeper. Only the steward, for a few moments, stops the outpouring of loathing that continues to the end.

Other scenes could be used, but it is obvious that *Timon*

of *Athens* has one tone, continued throughout; one effect and this effect Shaksperian. This must establish a strong probability that this play is by one author, and that author is Shakspeare.

Eveleth, Minn.

¹⁸H. H. Wright, *The Authorship of Timon of Athens*. 1910, p. vii.

²In *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, Vol. II.

³*Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society*, 1874.

⁴Other datings offered for *Timon* are: Deighton (in *Arden Shakespeare*), 1606-10, B. K. Chambers, 1608. My own surmise is that it is of the period 1606-1608.

⁵*Timon of Athens*, (New York, 1905), p. xxi.

⁶Wright, pp. 101-102.

⁷T. M. Parrott, *The Problem of Timon of Athens*, 1923, p. 28.

⁸"The Problem of *Timon of Athens*," in *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* (1924), pp. 1-48. (p. 2).

⁹"Shakespeare's Purpose in *Timon of Athens*", *PMLA*, XLIII (1928), pp. 701-721

¹⁰*William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems* (1930), vol. 1, p. 482

¹¹Robertson, pp. 145-150.

¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 150-151.

¹³*The Wheel of Fire*, (1930), p. 229.

¹⁴Here is a case where the critics are hoist with their own petard. A while back they denied scenes III, i, ii, iii, to Shakspeare because he had not written the ten lines which make the scene logical. Here, on the other hand, they do not allow Shakspeare the invitation to the banquet, but they do give him the banquet

¹⁵Is the steward's name Flavius? In the Folio, I, ii, 160, Timon calls him Flavius, and the speech headings call him *Fla*. In II, ii, 190, however, Timon is talking to his steward, and calls for Flavius. The three servants who go to Timon's false friends, however, are Servilius, Flaminius, and "a third servant." It is a case, I believe, of Shakspeare's forgetting these conventionalized Athenian names. Nothing could be more likely to happen in rapid composition. There is, likewise, some confusion about Lucius. In I, ii, 187, he presents Timon with "Four milk-white horses, trapp'd with silver." In III, ii, he is out of money when Timon wishes to borrow. The list of actors' names in the Folio makes an added difficulty, for here there is a Lucius who is servant to a usurer. I do not find it as hard as Mr. Wright to believe that the same man could give a splendid gift—with the expectation of getting it back tenfold,—decline a loan, and press at once for an older debt. Probably there is only one Lucius, and the servant gets his name from his master.

As for the list of characters in the Folio *Timon* ends on page 98, and the extra leaf—actors' names on one side, blank on the other, fills out a printer's "take"—three sheets, six leaves, twelve pages. It is clear that this list was hastily prepared in the print-shop to fill one side of the blank leaf. It is the only list of this kind in the Folio. The list is most inaccurate, and has no authority. It omits the following: the steward, Lucilius, the fool, and the two courtizans, Timandra and Phrynia.

¹⁶It is to be noted that these "spurious" lines are sometimes obscure to the point of unintelligibility, and again, as in V, iii, plain to the point of childishness. Yet the critics say the same unknown wrote both

¹⁷*Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, 1875, p. 531.

¹⁸*New Shakespeare Society Trans.* (London, 1874), p. 243

SHAKSPERE FOR PLEASURE

By I. C. KELLER

THERE are two possible approaches to the study of Shakspeare—the scholarly and the pleasurable. In a limited number of students the two are combined; to them the scholarly is the pleasurable. They are interested in discovering the chronology of the plays or the date of a single play. To this end they carefully scrutinize internal and external evidence, the prevalence of rhyme, the kind of blank verse used, the frequency with which puns appear, and other such scholarly matters. They attempt to determine whether the play came entirely from the pen of the great dramatist or whether some contemporary collaborated in its writing. To this inner group of scholars the world is indebted for the accumulated mass of Shaksperian knowledge we are fortunate enough to possess. The extent of this debt can not be overestimated, for it has made possible the approach to be discussed in this paper—the pleasurable.

By this approach I mean the popular, the interest that millions reveal in sitting down to read a play with a fair degree of understanding, or paying a small sum to attend the theatre and enjoy the thrill an excellent performance gives. This is the uncritical approach, one that does not require the critical insight of the scholar. However, there are certain essentials which one should possess if this approach is to furnish the desired pleasure.

In the first place, a satisfying knowledge of the Elizabethan Age will greatly help. This knowledge will include some understanding of the steps through which the English drama came up to this age, why the age was dramatic, what the condition of the theater was, and the nature of the audience that attended plays. It will also include a somewhat comprehensive knowledge of the literary and social conditions, and other factors influencing the production and presentation of the drama. All this background knowledge will greatly increase the pleasure the plays brings to the reader or the listener.

In the second place, some familiarity with plays written by dramatists other than Shakspeare will intensify this pleas-

ure. No one can fully appreciate Shakspeare's genius until he has read some of the plays written by other Elizabethan dramatists. In such plays as *The Alchemist*, *The Duchess of Malfi*, *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *Philaster*, and other well-known plays of this period the pleasure seeker will find much that will interest and please him, but he will miss more. The tragic power revealed in *The Duchess of Malfi* will impress him, but it will also make him appreciate more fully the superiority of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and the other great Shaksperian tragedies. Through this contrast he will come to marvel at the incomparable dramatic artistry of Shakspeare; he will better understand relative greatness in the world of drama; he will come to appreciate the application of such descriptive words as poor, fair, good, excellent, and great, when applied to the drama.

Then, if he really wants to add to the pleasurable interest, he will want to know something about the man who wrote these enduring dramas. True, he will soon discover that our actual, recognized knowledge is painfully limited—that tradition and legend are often substituted for authenticated facts. Of course, he will understand that few records were kept then of the lives of the middle and lower classes and will fit this fact into the meagerness of our knowledge of the man Shakspeare. He will marvel that such a man and such dramas could come from such limited opportunities. He will put together the data the scholars have assembled and use these facts as a background against which to project his pleasurable quest.

Finally, after some investigation in the great Elizabethan Age, some reading of dramas by other dramatists, and increased intimacy with the known facts of the dramatist's life, the Shaksperian seeker will come to the plays themselves—the real object of his search for pleasure. Naturally his curiosity will lead him to ask where the dramatist got his material for all his varied plays. If the ancient Israelites couldn't make bricks without straw, neither can a dramatist write dramas without suitable material. A hasty glance into Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Plutarch's *Lives*, and various old plays and stories, followed by the study of the plays in which these materials were used, will reveal the

marvelous skill of the master dramatist. One concrete example will heighten his admiration. If he reads Mark Antony's speech in *Julius Caesar*, he will be in a position to appreciate Shakspeare's incomparable skill in adapting material for dramatic use.

Then, too, he will enjoy the great variety of plots used in the plays. In the development of these interesting plots he will find satisfaction for his love of unusual stories. How an Iago skilfully controls every character his life touches, how a Lear-plot and a Gloster-plot are woven together to form a unified whole, how a philosophical Hamlet through procrastination brings destruction to friend and foe, how the ambition of a Macbeth and his queen ends in total tragedy, how Portia helps to bring about the triumph of justice—these and many other stories forming the plots of the plays will bring keen pleasure to the reader of Shakspeare.

At first, he may find some difficulty in pronouncing and understanding the meaning of some of the words used, but modern editions will help him to overcome this difficulty. If he is a student of language, such words as *presently*, *dear*, *cashiered*, *doubt*, and many others will challenge him and stimulate his interest in the study of language past and present. He will marvel that a man who was supposed to know "little Latin and less Greek" possessed such a mastery of the language of his day. From time to time a single word will open before him vistas of meaning. Such a word is "filch," as used by Iago in his conversation with Othello—"he that filches from me my good name." He will see the village gossip at work. Similarly, hundreds of words will link themselves to modern suggestions and intensify his immediate pleasure.

As he reads various plays, and compares or contrasts them with plays by other Elizabethan dramatists, he will be particularly impressed by the absence of great passages in the latter plays and the presence of innumerable memorable passages in those of Shakspeare. He will find here one of the most outstanding differences between the works of these dramatists. A Hamlet debating between life and death, a King Henry IV analyzing his inability to sleep, a

Macbeth trying to steel himself to kill a friendly king, a Portia defending an innocent man, a Marc Antony following a Brutus and inciting a mob to riot, a Lear contrasting needs and wants—these and a hundred others will reveal to him Shakspeare the thinker and the word-artist. The student who likes to store away in his memory great lines that will always enrich his thinking and his living will find an inexhaustible store from which to select.

But there remains yet the greatest appeal of all—the vital interest in human beings. Here is where Shakspeare is supreme. The 835 characters appearing in his 37 plays constitute the finest laboratory course for the study of human nature. If he wants to laugh or cry, hate or love, admire or detest, he will find some character to satisfy his wish. He can laugh with Falstaff, love with Desdemona, think with Hamlet, scheme with Henry IV, plot with Edmund, and talk with Polonius; in fact, there is no human emotion that Shakspeare does not satisfy. Even his characters which are minor in these great plays outshine many that are major in the plays of most other dramatists, while Shakspeare's major characters stand in a world by themselves. They are as well known as the actual men and women who have made the history of the world. A feeling that one knows them enriches one's life in the same way that actual friendships do.

Possibly most Shaksperian readers are not likely to pass through all these stages suggested here. In any case, the scholarly approach will not appeal to them; they will be satisfied to have a somewhat cursory knowledge of these suggested helps. However, the extent to which they know the Elizabethan Age, the plays of other dramatists, the man Shakspeare, and the sources, plots, language, great passages, and characters of the plays, will determine to a great degree the genuineness of the pleasure Shakspeare brings to them. They will find that Shakspeare takes them out of the utilitarian, commercialized, materialistic world in which they live. For a brief time they are in the world of *As You Like It* or *The Tempest*. They learn to know better the people whom they daily see because they have briefly lived with the men and women of Shakspeare. They more clearly recognize moral worth and more deeply appreciate beauty

because Shakspeare has helped them more clearly to understand and evaluate life. Little by little they come to realize why "He was not of an age, but for all time."

*State Teachers College
California, Pa.*

COMMUNICATION:

THE ANCESTRY OF AUTOLYCUS

Miss White's conscientiously detailed and elaborately documented "Biography of Autolycus" in the July *Bulletin* provokes two comments.

The first is that her account of her character's ancestry is inadequate. In her last paragraph she virtually brushes aside various attempts to associate Autolycus with stock characters of the earlier drama. I wonder if she is familiar with the character of Simplicity in Robert Wilson's plays, *The Three Ladies of London* (c. 1584) and *The Three Lords and the Three Ladies of London* (c. 1589). The correspondence in outline is so close as to justify the assumption that Shakspeare carried in his mind a memory of that "Vice" of secular life. Simplicity, for example, joins in a beggar's and stealer's song which mentions catching sheets from hedges (Dodsley's *Old Plays*, 1874, VI. 347); the adjacent dialogue records other delights of the beggar's calling, such as lousing oneself under a hedge in summer, clipping and colling Madge, walking abroad to "take the wholesome air" and "tumble on the grass." Later Simplicity appears as a pedlar of ballads with comic titles (Dodsley, VI. 393). For other claimants to the honor of progeniture see also "Ancestors of Autolycus in the English Moralities and Interludes," *Washington University Studies, Humanistic Series*, IX (1922), 157-64 (cited by R. G. Noyes in his "Conventions of Song in Restoration Tragedy," *PMLA*, LIII. 1 (1938), 162).

The second remark will have occurred to anyone who has heard Pro-

fessor Kittredge's exposition of *The Winter's Tale*. Miss White has fallen a victim to Autolycus's tongue and believed his fantastic story of his life, the component parts of which are self-contradictory—a petty thief's son who "served" Prince Florizel in three-pile velvet (cf. "Master Three-Pile, the mercer," *M for M*, IV, iii, 11), possibly as a "gentleman-courtier," but then was whipped out of the Court (certainly not standard punishment for even as poor a gentleman as a younger son of a younger son) and now is "out of service" (strange phrase for a gentleman to use). When he "compassed" a puppet show, he did not "make" it (Miss White's word) but stole it; when he settled in rogue, he made no change in what had been his way of life from birth. Professor Kittredge quoted Professor Child's remark that if Autolycus was employed at Court at all, it was probably in blacking boots; and he pointed with telling force to his inability to wear gentlemen's clothes like a gentleman and to the absurdity of a "gentleman's" calling the Clown "sweet sir." The fun of all this is of course the transparency of Autolycus's attempt to deceive.

No, Autolycus is a stock figure of the older drama brought to life by the touch of Shakspeare. Of course he is too witty and learned for verisimilitude, but we are used to that in Shaksperian characters, and thank God for it; we need not suppose that Autolycus, any more than his creator, learned classical allusions at the University.

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS.
Brown University.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

By S. A. T.

TWELFTH NIGHT (?)

We have seen *Twelfth Night* on Broadway; to be exact, on 44th Street, at the St. James Theatre. Not Shakspeare's *Twelfth Night*, although the words (not all) sounded familiar, but Miss Webster's *Twelfth Night*. The two are not identical. Shakspeare wrote a lovely romantic comedy; Miss Webster fed her audience with a farce comedy which very frequently degenerated into burlesque. The key words to this performance were hokum and slapstick; all that were missing were the pies of Chaplin memory and similar business. Needless to say, the spectators had a good time and declared it rapturously a "won-der-ful" performance; it roared its delight when Malvolio put Olivia's veil over the top of a garden-rake and addressed the combination as if it were the lady herself, even turning her veil up to take a look at the Lady's rakish face. That's humor—of a sort. The audience also enjoyed the clever business of Sir Andrew's wrapping himself in a window drape and falling with it; and it howled its joy when the merry-makers pinned two long trailers to Malvolio's upstanding tail-end and he haughtily sauntered off without knowing what he was dragging behind him. Other such original business was greeted with guffaws of delight, e.g., the conspirators hiding behind the flower-tubs and carrying them from place to place. Utterly inexcusable is the cheap angling for a laugh when Viola brings Olivia what looks like a 50c bouquet of artificial flowers from Duke Orsino. And even worse than this, if anything can be worse, is Malvolio's carrying this bouquet hidden in his coat-tail until he pulls it out and throws it at Viola after he had given the ring to her.

And, no doubt, the audience enjoyed seeing Sir Toby in the last scene trundled in sitting in a gaily-colored baby cart with an umbrella over him.

The costuming was rich, colorful, and pleasing to the eye. The stage appointments were inadequate and disappointing, the staging was often absurdly incongruous, as when Viola and the Captain come out upon the rocky shore from a door leading into a substantial mansion. Orsino's home was very poorly and meagerly furnished.

In this performance Feste (Donald Burr) "ran away with the show"; he is tall, handsome, youthful, sprightly and nimble, capers well, is good at turning somersaults, and sings delightfully. Fortunately, he was given many opportunities to show his many talents. The music, which was written for him by Mr Paul Bowles, had just the right spirit and rhythm. Fabian (Raymond Johnson), made up as a French cook, was excellent in his part, small though it is. Andrew Aguecheek (Wallace Acton) passed. Toby Belch (Mark Smith) was huge and big but he was not Sir Toby; at times he was a tenor, a few seconds later he was a bass, he did not seem to know which he was. Neither was he consistently drunk or sober. Maria (June Walker) was mischievous, lively, and always on the go—which is as it should be. Sophie Stewart, as Olivia, was terribly disappointing; she raved and ranted throughout the performance.

Helen Hayes was disappointing as Viola; she did not bring to the part the youthfulness, the pulchritude and the charm which should characterize Viola, she spoke her lines—all but the "willow cabin" speech (which she read exquisitely)—as if they were

the prosiest commonplaces, in a terribly matter-of-fact way; she strutted when she should have walked; she roared at the audience when she should have been thinking to herself; she was too obviously intent on making points and driving them home; her arms were in constant motion, like the wings of a windmill in a strong breeze, the subtleties of Viola's character eluded her, though now and then she did manifest the necessary wistfulness. The silly horseplay in her fencing scene, so utterly uncalled for, consisting of prancing and dancing and ridiculous sword-whirling, is traditional and not to be charged against Miss Hayes. Miss Webster is probably responsible for that. We shall probably be told that Miss Webster's genius 'shook the dust from Shakspeare'; but there is no dust on Shakspeare that needs sweeping. To us it seems that Miss Webster washed the perfume out of Shakspeare, or, to change the figure, she retained the body and killed the soul.

The greatest failure, however, in this production is Mr. Maurice Evans as Malvolio. In our estimation Mr. Evans is not an actor, he is a reader; his face is incapable of subtleties of expression, he is too pretty for Malvolio and he does not understand the character. Malvolio has a permanent sourness of disposition, sufficiently indicated by his name, but Mr. Evans makes him a not unpleasant strutting peacock—and no more. Mr. Evans rarely speaks his lines as if he meant what he is saying; he is reciting pieces. Why he makes Malvolio a cockney, dropping his initial *h*'s and his final *g*'s and saying "Laidy" instead of "Lady," is beyond our comprehension; his struggling with the pronunciation of "slough" and "opposite" is irritating, not funny. Mr. Evans's best bit of acting was the

scornful way in which he said the word "Run?" when Olivia commanded him to run after the peevish messenger; but it must be remembered that Shakspeare never wrote that "Run" for Malvolio. In several other places, too, such liberties are taken with the text.

The ending of the performance, with the dancing and the singing of "the Rain it raineth every day" by the whole company, makes an effective and charming close and sends the audience forth in gay good humor.

THE NAMES IN AS YOU LIKE IT

Veteran lovers of Shakspeare know that the names he assigned to many of his *dramatis personae* possess various degrees of significance and sometimes serve as keys to their characters, or to their physical appearance, or to their occupations, or to the rôle they play in the story. For some undiscoverable reason, Shakspeare resorted to this technical device with unusual persistency just about the turn of the century. Several scholars have called attention to the exquisite appropriateness of some of these 'onomatopoeic names' ('bow-wow names' Hiram Corson called them) in *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*, but no one, as far as we know, has pointed out the fact that almost every name occurring in *As You Like It* is a significant name.

'Rosalind' is, of course a beautiful rose. Fletcher, quoted by Furness, rapturously comments: '*Rosalinda* is . . . a Spanish name, . . . meaning, in short, exquisitely graceful, beautiful, and sweet. The analogy will at once be seen which the image of the graceful rose bears to the exquisite spirit of Rosalind, no less than her

buoyant figure in all its blooming charms.'

'Celia' is derived from the Latin *coelum* and means 'heavenly,' a fit companion for 'Rosalinda.' Shakspeare, having assigned 'Rosalinde' to his heroine, had no choice but to assign 'Celia' to her loyal and beautiful cousin.

'Phoebe,' the lovely shepherdess, takes her name from the moon, Rosalind being the sun.

'Audrey,' the country wench (so the books describe her), gets her name from the English word 'tawdry,' probably as a clue to her bad taste in clothes. Or, because of her 'honesty,' Shakspeare may have associated her with St. Audry. Some say that the word means 'pretty,' 'rustic,' which, too, would be quite appropriate.

'Silvius,' from *silva* (meaning 'forest') is a fitting name for a shepherd.

'Corin,' a shepherd's name, is the masculine for 'Corinna,' a name which Herrick's charming lyric ('Corinna goes a-Maying') has made famous, and which Shakspeare probably knew from his Ovid.

'Le Beau' is obviously the pretty one, a fop, an effeminate man. 'Amiens,' from Latin *amo*, is the amiable one, agreeable, not quarrelsome. 'Jaques,' the melancholy philosopher who will not return to the court, is he 'who follows' those who give him food for thought. Or, possibly, Shakspeare thought him a filthy fellow and therefore gave him a name suggestive of 'jakes' (which reminds us of Ajax). 'Charles,' the wrestler, is appropriately named; the word is derived from the Teutonic *Kerl* (a churl), and means 'strong,' 'robust.' We are told that

it was not a popular name in England before the reign of the Stuarts.

'Adam' was probably assigned to the good old servant because the word means 'man,' and 'man' is a good Elizabethan designation for 'servant.' Dennis may have been given his name because he is a bit tipsy (suggestive of a follower of Dionysius).

'Orlando,' as we know, is merely a variant for 'Roland,' a famous knight in medieval romances. Having a Roland, Shakspeare had to provide him with an Oliver; the former being the hero, the latter had to be the villain.

'Touchstone' is obviously so named because he is the touchstone by which we test the relative merits of the country and the city, the simplicity of the rustics and the artificiality of the courtiers. 'William,' a variant of *Wilhelm*, a helmet of resolution, was probably assigned to the lukewarm and easily yielding lover on the principle of opposites.

Duke Frederick, the usurping tyrant, seems to be the only improperly named person in the play. 'Frederick,' meaning, a 'peaceful ruler,' is utterly inappropriate for him. It is possible that this name was intended for the banished Duke and that something went wrong either in the composition of the play or during a revision. Or was Shakspeare a bit cynical?

Do the above facts teach us anything about Shakspeare? We think they do. They show that he was not the hasty and careless writer that the books say he was; that he paid considerable attention even to the minutest details that went into his compositions. Secondly, that he was much more scholarly than has been generally thought

January, 1941

Vol. XVI, No. 1

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



Annual Bibliography of Shaksperiana for 1940

Index of Names in the 1940 Bibliography

In Defense of Bassanio

I Know a Hawk from a Handsaw

A Contemporary Attack Upon Shakspeare



Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET

New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH

15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.

Major Edward Bowes

Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.

Hardin Craig, Ph.D.

Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.

Frank Gilmore

Walter Hampden

Frank J. Hogan

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.

George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.

Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.

Fritz Leiber

Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.

Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.

John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.

Julia Marlowe, LL.D.

Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.

Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.M.

Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.

Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.

Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.

Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.

Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Otis Skinner, A.M.

Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.

John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison

70 Broadway

New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum

601 West 118th Street

New York

Board of Directors

1936

John Robert Gregg

Paul Kaufman

Robert M. Smith

Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1937

Miss Olive I. Carter

Arthur Heine

Frank L. Short

Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1938

George W. Davison

John E. Hannigan

John H. H. Lyon

Miss Charlotte E. Porter

A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVI

JANUARY, 1941

No. 1

C O N T E N T S

PAGE

Shakspere and His Contemporaries in the literature of 1940:

A classified bibliography S. A. Tannenbaum 2

Index of Names and Subjects in the 1940 Bibliography .. . Ralph P. Rosenberg 17

In Defense of Bassanio J. M. Ariail 25

I Know a Hawk from a Handsaw Haldeen Braddy 29

Shakspere's Dukes Curtis B. Watson 33

A Contemporary Attack Upon Shakspere? Alfred Harbage 42

An Early *Hamlet* Allusion Howard Schultz 50

Spenser's Fable of "*The Oake and the Brete*" Louis S. Friedland 52

Editorial Notes and Comments S. A. T. 58

Communication: Which Daniel? John E. Hannigan 63

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

SHAKSPERE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

(A Classified Bibliography for 1940)

Compiled by

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

The following bibliography, based on an examination of the contents of more than 1,400 periodicals and hundreds of books, is a continuation of that published in this BULLETIN in January, 1940. Perfunctory notices of books, blurbs, and reviews which contribute nothing new, have not been noted. The names of female writers are distinguished by a colon (instead of a period) after the initial letter of the baptismal name. The titles of books and pamphlets are printed in italics. If no year is mentioned in connection with an item, '1940' is to be understood. Reviews of books are listed (without a preceding number), without title, immediately after the books themselves. The discussion of a book is indicated by printing the title within single quotes. The abbreviations employed herein, and what they stand for, follow herewith:

| | | | |
|--------------|---|---------|--|
| A | —Anglia | Lit | —Literature |
| Abstr. | —Abstract | Ln | —London. |
| Amer. | —American | M | —Magazine |
| B | —Bulletin | MLN | —Modern Language Notes |
| bib. | —bibliography | MLQ | —Modern Language Quarterly |
| BJRL | —Bulletin of the John Rylands Library | MLR | —Modern Language Review |
| Cambr. | —Cambridge | MP | —Modern Philology |
| comp. | —compiler | mus | —music |
| Col. | —Columbia | NQ | —Notes and Queries |
| CR | —Contemporary Review | OUP | —Oxford University Press |
| CUP | —Cambridge University Press | P | —Press |
| Diss. | —Dissertation | pll | —plates |
| d | —der, die, das, dem, etc. | PMLA | —Publications of the Modern Lan- guage Ass'n. |
| dt. | —deutsch, deutscher, etc. | port(s) | —portrait(s) |
| ed., edd. | —editor, editors | p. p. | —privately printed |
| ELH | —Journal of English Literary His- tory | PQ | —Philological Quarterly |
| Eliz'n | —Elizabethan | Proc | —Proceedings |
| Engl. | —English, Englische | Q | —Quarterly. |
| ES | —Englische Studien | QR | —Quarterly Review |
| facs., facs. | —facsimile, facsimiles | R | —Review, Revue |
| f | —für | RES | —Review of English Studies |
| Fr | —French | Ru | —Russian |
| fr | —from | SAB | —Shakespeare Ass'n Bulletin |
| Hist | —History | Sh | —Shakespeare, Shakspeare |
| HLQ | —Huntington Library Quarterly | Shn | —Shaksperian |
| HUP | —Harvard University Press | SJ | —Shakespeare Jahrbuch |
| ils | —illustrated, illustrations | SP | —Studies in Philology |
| intr | —introduction | TLS | —Times Literary Supplement (Ln) |
| J | —Journal | tr. | —translator |
| JEGP | —Journal of English and Germanic Philology | tm | —translation |
| Libr | —Library | u. | —und |
| | | U | —University |
| | | UP | —University Press |

The compiler's best thanks are due to the publishers, libraries, and personal friends who have assisted him in one way or another in making this compilation.

ABROAD

1. Sh in Icelandic historical survey.—S. Einarsson.—ELH, 7: 272-85, Dec.
- 1a. *Sh in Japan: An Historical Survey*.—M. Toyoda.—Tokyo, pp. xii + 140, bib.

ABSTRACTS

2. *More New Tales fr Sh*.—G. B. Harrison.—Ln: Nelson, 14s.

AMERICA

3. Sh's plays in Richmond, 1819-38.—M. S. Shackley.—SAB, 15: 88-93, Apr., 1940.
4. Representative American criticism of Sh, 1830-85. [MS diss, 1939].—R. P. Falk.—At the U of Wisconsin.

ANTHOLOGY

5. G. Rylands' *The Ages of Man*.—B. E. Sears.—The Adelphi, 16: 169-72, Jan.

APOCRYPHA

6. L. Theobald's alleged Sh manuscript: *The Double Falsehood*.—J. Cadwalader.—MLN, 55: 108, Feb.

AUTHORSHIP QUESTION

7. *Sh Unmasked*.—P. S. Porohovshikov.—N. Y.: Savoy Pub. Co (63 Park Row), \$3
8. Sh & the Tong epitaph.—E. B. Goodacre.—NQ, 178: 96-97 (Feb. 10).—W Jaggard; NQ, 178: 178-79 (Mar. 9).

BACON, FRANCIS

9. The literary background of the essay 'Of death'.—M: Walters.—MLR, 35: 1-7, Jan.
10. F. B. & Oxford.—P. S. Porohovshikov.—*Sh Unmasked*, pp. 255-70.
11. F. B.—J. H. Randall.—*The Making of the Modern Mind*, pp. 213-15, &c.

BACON-SHAKSPERE IMBROGLIO

12. Bacon-Sh anatomy.—W. S. Melsome.—Baconiana, 24: 175-90, Oct., 1939.
13. *The Tragedy of F. Bacon, Prince of England*.—[W. McC. Cunningham].—Los Angeles, pp. 96, front.

14. Sh or Bacon.—E. Heron-Allen.—NQ, 179: 26, July 13.
15. Sh or Bacon.—G. W. Wright.—NQ, 179: 125, Aug. 17.
See 28.

BALE, JOHN

16. J. B.: *A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation*.—J. W. Harris.—Urbana: U of Illinois P., pp. 158, \$1.50.
17. Baconian studies: The poet & God's word.—J. Arther.—Theosophist, 61: 37-49, Apr.

BEAUMONT & FLETCHER

18. The source of Motherwell's 'Melancholy'.—E. R. Wasserman.—MLN, 55: 296, Apr.
19. F. B.'s 'Grammar Lecture'.—M. Eccles.—RES, 16: 402-14, Oct.

BIBLE

20. *The Book of Proverbs in Sh*.—M. H. Dodds.—NQ, 179: 34, July 13.
21. The high design of *A King & No King*.—A. Mizener.—MP, 38: 133-54, Nov.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

22. *Census of Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts in the U. S. & Canada*. [Vol 3].—S. De Ricci & W. J. Wilson, compilers.—N. Y.: H. W. Wilson Co., pp. viii + 222, \$3. (The 3 vols, \$17.)
23. Sh & his contemporaries in the lit of 1939.—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—SAB, 15: 2-22, Jan.—Index to this bibliography prepared by R. P. Rosenberg, SAB, 15: 95-102, Apr.
24. American bibliography for 1939.—M. Henshaw, A. C. Baugh, G. Paine, et al.—PMLA, 54: 1199-1313, Apr.
25. H: C. Bartlett's *A Census of Sh's Plays in Quarto*.—W. W. Greg; RES, 16: 208-11, Apr.—J. Q. Adams; JEGP, 39: 405-07, July
26. Recent lit of the Renaissance.—H. Craig, et al.—SP, 37: 283-460, Apr.
27. *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700: An Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged*.—A. Harbage.—Phila.: U of Pa. P, pp. [viii] + 264, \$3.50.
See 89, 94.

BIOGRAPHY

28. Is Sh's will a forgery?—A. Stalker.—Quarterly R, 274: 248-62, Apr.
29. The Shn puzzle.—P. C. Ray.—Calcutta R, 73: 129-39 (Nov. 1939), 247-56 (Dec.); 74: 1-13 (Jan. 1940), 103-12 (Feb.), 231-37 (Mar.); 75: 1-12 (Apr.), 91-100 (May); 76: 1-8 (July), 115-24 (Aug.); 77: 1-10 (Oct.).
30. The spelling of Sh's surname.—M. H. Dodds.—NQ, 178: 304-05, Apr. 27.
31. An agnostic life of Sh.—R. M. Smith.—SAB, 15: 75-87, Apr.
32. The spelling of 'Sh.'—C. L. E. Ewen.—NQ, 178: 358-59 (May 18), 448 (June 22).
33. The spelling of 'Sh.'—W. Jaggard; J. Seton-Anderson; F. C. White—NQ, 178: 392 (June 1), 412 (June 8).
34. Wm. Sh.: an epilogue.—E. K. Chambers.—RES, 16: 385-401, Oct.
35. *The Sh Documents: Facsimiles, Translations & Commentary.* (Vol. 1.)—R. B. Lewis—Stanford UP, pp. xxiv + 324, 29 pls, bib. (Vol. 2 to follow shortly, pre-publication price for both vols, \$25, post-publication price, \$35.)
See 216.
47. [*Maud No Mose*].—H. Simpson.—H, IV, v, 54.
48. *Too Dear for My Possessing*.—P: H. Johnson.—Sonnet 87, l. 1
49. *This [Our] Eden*.—K. B. Burt.—Richard II, II, i, 42.
50. *Weep No More*.—A: Du Maurier.—King Lear, III, iv, 17.
51. *Nine Times Nine*.—H. H. Holmes.—Macbeth, I, iii, 22.
52. *Under the Greenwood Tree*.—J. L. Reynolds.—As You Like It.
53. *Come Unto These Yellow Sands*.—E. Schenck.—The Tempest.
54. *Deed Without a Name*.—D: Bowers.—Macbeth, IV, i, 49.
55. *Malice Domestic*.—E: Cameron.—Macbeth, III, ii, 25
56. *Of Human Kindness*.—R. C. Mitchell.—Macbeth, I, v, 18.
57. *The Evil Men Do*.—C. Fitzsimmons.—Julius Caesar, III, ii, 80.
- 57a. *This for Remembrance*.—J. Neilson.—Hamlet, IV, v, 175

BRETON, NICHOLAS

58. N. B. Wm Breton, & G. Gascoigne.—F. Flournoy.—RES, 16: 262-73, July.

CHAPMAN, GEORGE

59. G. C. & his dedication to *The Revenge*. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—Literary Criticism, pp. 549-50.

COMEDY

60. *Shn comedy*.—R. E. C. Houghton.—TLS, May 4, p. 219
61. Comedy.—A. E. Du Bois.—ELH, 7: 199-214, Sept.
See 122, 411.

COMMENTARY

36. Paintings of Sh's birds exhibited.—N. Y. Times, Dec. 14, p. 12.
37. *The Birds of Sh*.—L: Stockelbach.—N.p., n.d., pp. 52, front, \$1.
- Book Titles from Sh, Recent
38. *Leave Her to Heaven*.—J. Van Drueten.—H, I, v, 86.
39. *Summer's Lease*.—Son, XVIII, 4.
40. *The Floor of Heaven*.—S. C. Bates.—MV, V, i, 58.
41. *Who Tells Me True*.—M: Strange.—A&C, I, ii, 102.
42. *Hot Irons*.—O. Arnold & J. P. Hale.—KJ, IV, i, 39.
43. *The Quality of Mercy*.—G: Macurdy.—MV, IV, i, 184.
44. [*A*] *Comedy of [T]errors*.—M. Innes.—Errors.
45. *The Seeds of Time*.—A. G. Antony.—Macbeth, I, iii, 58.
46. *Of Heaven's Benediction*.—M: G. Nichols.—Lear, II, ii, 168.
62. *The Art & Life of Wm. Sh*.—H. Spencer.—N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., pp. xx + 496, 41 pls, bib., \$2.25.—Sewanee R, 48: 284-86, Apr.—TLS, June 15, p. 294.—C. J. Sisson; MLN, 55: 534-36, Nov.
63. Sh's gulls.—J. S. Schell.—SAB, 15: 23-33, Jan.
64. Review of some recent books on Sh.—T. W. Baldwin.—MLN, 55: 455-62, June.

65. Roan Barbary.—P. Fatour—SAB, 15: 67-74, Apr.
66. *The Enjoyment of Drama*.—M. Marx.—N. Y.: F. S. Crofts & Co., \$2.
67. *Masters of the Drama*.—J. Gassner.—N. Y. pp. 804, 21 ils.
68. *Preface to World Lit.*.—A. Guérard.—N. Y.. pp. 536.
69. H. Baker's *Induction to Tragedy*.—A. Thaler.—JEGP, 39: 399-401, July.
70. W. C. Curry's *Sh's Philosophical Patterns*.—T. W. Baldwin.—JEGP, 39: 402-04, July.
71. *Sh & Other Masters*.—E. E. Stoll.—Harvard U P, pp. xvi + 432, \$4.50.
72. *The Human Element in Literature*.—D. E. Phillips.—NY. Fortuny, pp. 230.
73. Stoll's *Sh & Other Masters*.—J. Corbin.—N. Y. Times Book R, Dec. 8, p. 34.
74. S. T. Coleridge in criticism.—F. R. Leavis.—Scrutiny, 9: 57-69, June.
75. Garrick's treatment of Sh's plays & his influence upon the attitude of Shn criticism during the 18th century. [MS. diss.]—G. W. Stone, Jr.—Harvard U.
76. Sh's dramatic romances. [MS. diss.]—W. A. Bacon.—U of Michigan.
77. Sh's old men.—L. W. Miles.—ELH, 7: 286-99, Dec.
See 31.
86. A 'Drake' mystery.—C. R. Prance.—National R, 115: 221-24, Aug.

CONTEMPORARY DRAMA

87. *The Tragedies of Herod & Mariamne*.—M. J. Valency.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. xiv + 304, bib, front, \$3.50.
88. The whereabouts of a copy of Tomkis's *Albumazar*.—H. G. Dick.—NQ, 178: 10, Jan. 6.
89. *A Chronological List of Extant Plays Produced in or about London, 1581-1642*.—A. W. Wells, comp.—N. Y.: CUP, pp. 18.
90. The authorship of *King Lear*.—W. Wells.—NQ, 177: 434-38, Dec. 16, 1939.
91. *Eliz'n Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642*.—F. T. Bowers.—Princeton UP, pp. x, 288, \$3.
92. *The Staging of Eliz'n Plays at the Red Bull Theatre, 1605-25*.—G. F. Reynolds.—N. Y.: Modern Language Ass'n of Amer., pp. x + 204, 6 ils, \$2.
93. *Masters of the Drama*.—J. Gassner.—N. Y.: Random House, pp. 804, \$3.75.
94. *A Bibliography of the Engl. Printed Drama to the Restoration*.—W. W. Greg, comp.—Ln, 1939, pp. xxxvi + 492, 63 pll.
95. The roaring boy in Tudor & Stuart literature.—B. Milligan.—SAB, 15: 184-90, July.
96. Eliz'n-Restoration palimpsest.—A. Harbage.—MLR, 35: 287-319, July.
97. *Eliz'n Plays & Players*.—G. B. Harrison.—Ln: Routledge, pp. viii + 306, map.
98. Bowers' *Eliz'n Revenge Tragedy*.—H. Spencer.—MLN, 55: 536-40, Nov.
99. The popular drama in England, 1600-1642. [MS. diss.]—R. M. Gorrell.—Cornell U.
100. The lesser Eliz'n playwrights on the Ln stage from 1776 to 1833. [MS. diss.]—D. J. Ruffs.—U of No. Ca.
101. Notes on H. Porter.—J. M. Nosworthy.—MLR, 35: 517-21, Oct.
See 27, 34.

CONTEMPORARIES

78. W. Perkins, Eliz'n apostle of 'practical divinity'.—L. B. Wright.—HLQ, 3: 171-96, Jan.
79. *The Letters of J. Chamberlain* [With an intr.].—N. E. McClure.—Phila: Amer. Philos. Soc., 2 vols.
80. B. Rych's *Anatomy of Ireland*.—E. M. Hinton.—PMLA, 55: 73-101, Mar.
81. Notes on I. Jones.—E. S. de Beer.—NQ, 178: 290-92 (Apr. 27), 312-15 (May 4).
82. *Catalogue of the Works of P. Holland of Coventry*.—H. Silvette.—Charlottesville, pp. xviii + 30, port., \$1.50.
83. A. Nixon, plagiarist.—L. Ennis.—HLQ, 3: 377-401, July.
84. G. Harvey.—V. de S. Pinto.—TLS, Feb. 10, p. 73.
85. R. Chester.—E. B. Goodacre.—TLS, Mar. 9, p. 124.

CONTEMPORARY POETRY

102. L: B. Campbell's ed'n of *The Mirror for Magistrates*.—R. B. McKerrow; RES, 16: 78-81, Jan.—H. H. Hudson; MP, 38: 104-06, Aug.

103. Eliz'n poetry 'improved.'—E. R. Wasserman.—MP, 37: 357-69, May.
104. *Harington & Ariosto: A Study in Eliz'n Verse Translation*.—T. Rich.—New Haven: Yale U P.
105. *Some 17th-Century Worthies*.—R. B. Daniels.—Chapel Hill U of No. Ca., pp. 156, \$2.
106. *From Donne to Dryden*.—R. L. Sharpe.—Chapel Hill, pp. xiv + 222.
107. *The Divine Science: The Aesthetic of Some Representative 17th-Century English Poets*.—L. Jonas.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. viii + 292, \$3.
117. D's letters from the continent in 1611-12.—R. E. Bennett.—PQ, 19: 66-78, Jan.
118. Kepler, the *Somnium*, & J. D.—M: Nicolson.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 259-80, June.
119. *From J. D. to Dryden: The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry*.—R. L. Sharp.—Chapel Hill: U of No. Carolina P. \$3.
120. Textual differences in the interpretation of D's poems.—G. Williamson.—MP, 38: 37-72, Aug.
121. Scepticism in the writings of J. D. et al. [MS. diss.].—M. L. Wiley.—Radcliffe Coll.

CONTEMPORARY PROSE

108. T. Blundeville's *The true order & methode of wryting & reading Hystories* (1574).—H. G. Dick.—HLQ, 3: 149-70, Jan.
109. *The Conquest of the West India* (1578): *With an Intr.*—F. L. de Gómar. (H. I. Priestley, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (103 Park Ave.), pp. xxii + [420], \$7.50. (Facs repr.)
110. Popular anecdotal literature in 16th-century England. [MS. diss.].—S. S. McNeely.—U of Louisiana, pp. 366.

DAVENANT, WILLIAM

111. The 'lost' canto of *Gondibert*.—J. G. McManaway.—MLQ, 1: 63-78, Mar.
112. The source of Shadwell's *Sir Formal Trifle in The Virtuoso*.—G. B. Evans.—MLR, 35: 211-14, Apr.
See 107.

DEKKER, THOMAS

113. Puritanism in the plays & pamphlets of T. D.—M: G. M. Adkins.—*Studies in English* (U of Texas, 1939), pp. 86-113.
114. Principles governing the use of variant spellings as evidence of alternate setting of two compositors.—C. Hinman.—*The Library*, 21: 78-94, June.

DUNNE, JOHN

115. D's *Paradoxes* in 1707.—G. R. Potter.—MLN, 55: 53, Jan.
116. Verses on D's burial.—M: Brown.—NQ, 178: 12, Jan. 6.

DRAMA

122. *The Enjoyment of Drama*.—M. Marx.—N. Y.: Crofts, xii, 242, bib
See 87, 107

DRAYTON, MICHAEL

123. Contemporary praise of *Polyolbion*.—G. Tillotson, RES, 16: 181-83, Apr.
See 107, 160.

DUELING

124. *Dueling Scenes & Terms in Sh's Plays*.—H. S. Craig.—Berkeley: U of Calif. P, pp. iv + 28, bib (Repr fr U of Calif Public'ns in Engl, 9: 1-28)

EDUCATION

125. Sh read Greek.—E. T. Clark.—*News Letter*. Sh Fellowship, 1: 9-10, Feb

ELISABETH, QUEEN

126. Q. E.—T. Maynard.—Milwaukee: Bruce Pub'g Co., \$4.

ENVIRONMENT

127. L. B. Wright's *Middle-Class Culture in Eliz'n England*.—C. B. Mullican.—RES, 16: 84-87, Jan
128. F. B. Williams's *Eliz'n England*.—R. B. McKerrow.—RES, 16: 87-89, Jan
129. The genesis of Engl nationalism.—H. Kohn.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 69-94, Jan.
130. The 'Credulity' of the Eliz'ns.—M: Doran.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 151-76, Apr.

131. *The Renaissance*.—W. K. Ferguson.—N. Y., pp. viii, 148.
132. *Through Eliz'n Eyes: An Abridgment of Life in Sh's England, for Junior Readers*.—J. D. Wilson.—Cambridge, pp. 108; 72c.
133. *The Tudors & the Stuarts*.—M. M. Reese.—N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co., \$2.
134. The continental origins of Engl humanism.—A. Hyma.—HLQ, 4: 1-26, Oct.

FICTIONISED

135. *Gentleman of Stratford*. [A novel]—J. Brophy.—N. Y.: Harper, \$2.50.

FORD, JOHN

136. *Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of J. F.*—S. B. Ewing.—Princeton U Press, \$1.50.
See 96.

FORGERIES

137. A famous Sh forger of yesteryear & his undoing.—E. W. Bowen.—Virginia J of Educ'n, 33; 201-04, Feb., 1940.

FRANCE

138. Baudelaire & Sh.—M. I. Baym.—SAB, 15 131-48 (July), 195-205 (Oct.).
139. *A Bibliography of American Studies on the French Renaissance, 1500-1600*.—S. F. Will.—Urbana: U of Illinois P, pp. 152, \$1.50.
See 254.

GASCOIGNE, GEORGE

140. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres: With introd'n, notes, & glossary*. [MS. diss.]—C. T. Prouty, ed.—*Abstr of Dissertations . . . in the U of Cambridge* (1940), pp 70-71.

GERMANY

141. Sh im Deutschunterricht.—J. Müller.—*Zeitschr f Deutschkunde* (1939), 53: 497-517.
142. Whose Sh?—TLS, May 4, p. 219.
- 142a. The treatment of Sh's obscenity by 18th-century German translators.—O. F. Jones.—*Abstr. of Dissertations*, Stanford U., 15: 77-81, Nov.

GHOSTS

143. *Die Frage d Realität d Geistererscheinungen in Sh's Dramen*. (Diss.)—G. Gronauer.—Erlangen, 1939, pp. 82.
144. Ghosts on stage & in cinema; T. C. C.; NQ, 178: 444-45 (June 22).—M. H. Dodds, NQ, 179: 104-05 (Aug. 10).—H. G. L. K., NQ, 179: 138-39 (Aug. 24).

GREENE, ROBERT

145. Studies in the Greene-Sh relationship.—T. H. McNeal.—SAB, 15: 210-18, Oct.

GREVILLE, FULKE

146. G. Bullough's *Poems & Dramas of F. G.*—B. E. C. Davis, MLR, 35: 83-85, Jan., E: Carrick; RES, 16: 470-75, Oct.
147. F. G. on tragedy.—A. C. Edwards.—TLS, June 8, p. 279.

HARVEY, GABRIEL

148. G. H. & the modern languages.—C. B. Bourland.—HLQ, 4: 85-106, Oct.

HERRICK, ROBERT

149. R. H.'s sources.—G. G. Loane.—NQ, 178: 224-25, Mar. 30.
See 107, 157.

HEYWOOD, THOMAS

150. T. H. & his *Apology for Actors*. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, pp 552-64

INFLUENCE

151. T. Hardy's debt to Sh.—C. J. Weber.—*Hardy of Wessex* (N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. 246-57, &c.
152. J. F. Cooper & Sh.—E. P. Vandiver, Jr.—SAB, 15: 110-16, Apr.
153. A. Tenmyson's earliest Sh parallels.—E. A. Mooney, Jr.—SAB, 15: 117-24, Apr.

IRELAND

154. Sh was an Irishman.—T. F. Healy.—*Amer. Mercury*, 51: 24-32, Sept.
155. *A Historie of Ireland (1571): With an Intr.*—E. Campion. (R. B. Gottfried, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (100 W 31st Str.), pp. [xxiv] + 140, \$4.50. (Facs. repr.)

- 155a Sh & the Irish.—G. Dottridge, K. D. McQuigg.—*Amer. Mercury*, 51: 378, Nov

ITALY

156. Machiavelli's statecraft.—D. A. Traversi.—*Scrutiny*, 9: 186-93, Sept

JONSON, BEN

157. *Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben*.—K. A. McEuen.—Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch P., 1939, pp. xx + 316, bib, front, \$3.
158. *Volpone* & the reputation of Venetian justice.—R. H. Perkinson.—*MLR*, 35: 11-18, Jan.
- 159 The Lord Chamberlain's Company as portrayed in *Every Man Out*.—S. A. Eliot, Jr.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, 21: 64-80.
160. B. J. in Drayton's poems.—R. W. Short.—*RES*, 16: 149-58, Apr.
- 161 B. J.'s *Engl. Grammar*.—O. Funke.—*A*, 64: 117-34.
162. Bodin et B. J.—J. L. Brown.—*R de Litter Comparée*, 20: 66-81, Jan
163. B. J. in Drayton's poems.—P. Simpson & K. Tillotson.—*RES*, 16: 303-06, July.
164. J. B. Rousseau as an imitator of B. J.—H. A. Grubbs.—*MLN*, 55: 170-76, Mar.
165. Caroline echoes of *The Alchemist*.—C. Leech.—*RES*, 16: 432-38, Oct.
166. B. J. & selections fr *E. M. O. & Sejanus* [With notes].—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, pp. 534-39.
167. B. J. as social realist: *Barth. Fair*.—J. Symons.—*Southern R*, 6: 375-86, Oct
See 97, 107

KYD, THOMAS

168. T. K. & the chronicle history.—W. Wells.—*NQ*, 178: 218-24 (Mar. 30), 238-43 (Apr. 6)
169. '*Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*.'—W. Wells.—*NQ*, 179: 218-23 (Sept 28), 236-40 (Oct 5).

LANGUAGE

170. Literary features of Renaissance dictionaries.—D. T. Starnes.—*SP*, 37: 26-50, Jan.

171. 'Like himself.'—H. T. Price.—*RES*, 16: 178-81, Apr.
- 172 Sh in Newfoundland.—G: Tomkinson.—*Dalhousie R*, 20: 60-70, Apr.
- 173 An Eliz'n usage of 'quoth'—A F Herr.—*NQ*, 178: 152, Mar. 2.
- 174 *Psychology of English*.—M M Bryant & J. R Aiken.—*N. Y. Columbia U P*, pp. x + 230, \$2.50.

LODGE, THOMAS

- 175 T. L.: *A Concise Bibliography* [473 items].—S A Tannenbaum, comp.—*N. Y.* The compiler, pp x + 30, \$3.
See 97.

LYLY, JOHN

- 176 J L: *A Concise Bibliography*. [675 items].—S A. Tannenbaum—*N. Y.* The compiler, pp x + 38, \$3.25

MARLOWE, CHRISTOPHER

177. C. M.'s atheist lecture.—P. H. Kocher.—*JEGP*, 39: 98-106, Jan
178. The English *Faust Book* & the date of *Dr. Faustus*.—P H Kocher.—*MLN*, 55: 95-101, Feb.
179. C. M.: *A Biographical & Critical Study*.—F. S. Boas.—*N. Y. OUP*, pp xii, 336, 10 facs; \$4.50.—*NQ*, 178: 197-98, Mar. 16.—P Hutchinson; *N. Y. Times Book R*, June 23, p. 22.—U Ellis-Fermor, *RES*, 16: 342-45, July.—*TLS*, June 1, p. 268
180. C. M. & stage-history.—W. Jaggard.—*NQ*, 178: 233, Mar 30
181. The witchcraft basis in *Dr Faustus*.—P. H. Kocher.—*MP*, 38: 9-36, Aug
182. Greene, C. M. & Machiavelli.—F S. Boas.—*TLS*, Aug 3, p. 375
- 183 The forged letter from G. Peele to C M.—E H W Meyerstein.—*TLS*, June 29, p. 315.
184. C M's account of the death of Edward II.—H. W Crundell.—*NQ*, 179: 207, Sept. 21
- 184a *Dr Faustus*. [With intr & notes]—H. L. Cohen, ed.—*Milestones of the Drama*, pp. 126-69.
See 97.

MARSTON, JOHN

185. *John Marston: A Concise Bibliography*.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—*N. Y.*:

The compiler (601 W. 113th Str.), pp. x, 34; \$3 25.

MASSINGER, PHILIP

186. P. M.—TLS, Mar. 16, pp. 134 & 140
 187. P. M.—C. Leech, Mar. 23, p. 147.
 188. P. M. & part of I, ii, of *The Roman Actor*. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, pp. 568-73.
 189. *The Renegado*.—A. Senob, ed.—U of Chicago diss.

MEDICINE

190. *A Treatise of Melancholie*.—T. Bright.—N. Y.: CUP, pp. xxi + 284, \$2 60 (With an intr by H. Craig. Facs. of 1st ed'n, 1586.)
 191. Male & female created he them.—M. Huhner.—*Medical Times*, Mar., pp. 4.
 192. Sh's knowledge of twins & twinning.—G. Walsh & R. M. Pool.—*Southern Medicine & Surgery*, Apr., 4 pp. (Repr.)
 193. The practice of medicine in Tudor England.—G. Smith.—*Scientific Monthly*, 50: 65-72, Jan.

MISCELLANEA

194. 102 holographic mss. on Sh &c by B. Greet.—Offered for sale by G. W. Michelmores (Ln 1940), Catalogue No. 29, pp. 11-13.
 195. A Sh tour in wartime.—*Theatre Arts*, 24: 179-81, Mar.
 196. Sh — when?—I. Tyson.—SAB, 15: 57-59, Jan.
 197. A First Folio stolen from Williams College.—P. Brooks.—N. Y. Times Book R, Mar. 3, p. 23, 2 ils.
 198. 'Yon pomegranate tree.' [*Poem*.]—G. W. Landrum.—SAB, 15: 66, Apr.
 199. The Boydell Sh.—L. Thompson.—*The Princeton University Chronicle*, 1: 17-24, Feb., pl.
 200. The recovery of the stolen First Folio.—P. Brooks.—N. Y. Times Book R, Nov. 3, p. 18.
 201. Sixteenth- and 17th-century satire against grain engrossers.—B. Milligan.—SP, 37: 585-97, Oct.
 202. Sh on records.—H. T. Moore.—*Theatre Arts*, 24: 450-54, June.

203. Sh for pleasure.—I. C. Keller.—SAB, 15: 249-53, Oct.
 204. On reading Sh.—F. E. Slade.—*Poetry R*, 31 347-49, Sept.

MONTAIGNE, MICHEL de

205. The Le Brun collection of M.—I. Buffum.—*The Princeton University Chronicle*, 1: 11-16, Feb.
 206. *M. M. in France, 1812-1852*.—D. M. Frame.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, \$3. See 256.

MUSIC

207. *Eliz'n Music and Musical Criticism*.—M. C. Boyd.—Phila. U of Pa. P, pp. xii, 364; bib, 8 ils, \$3.50.
 208. A new song by Rob. Jones.—J. Q. Adams.—MLQ, 1: 45-48, Mar., facs, mus.
 209. Operatic morality.—H. G. Sear.—*Music & Letters*, 21: 60-74, Jan.
 210. Sh & music.—M. Castelnuevo-Tedesco.—SAB, 15: 166-74, July.
 211. *Plots of the Operas*.—O. Thompson, ed.—N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., \$2.
 212. M. M. Kastendieck's *England's Musical Poets*: T. Carew.—B. Pattison.—MLR, 35: 537-40, Oct.
 213. Drama & libretto: a study of 4 libretto-adaptations of 2 of Sh's plays. [MS. diss.]—J. L. Seymour.—U of Calif.

OXFORD-SHAKSPERE THEORY

214. Identifying Sh.—C. W. Barrell.—*Scientific American*, 162: 5-8 & 43-45, Jan., 18 ils.
 215. *Eliz'n Mystery Man*.—C. W. Barrell. N. Y.: A. Gauthier (17 E. 48th Str.), 25c.
 216. Sh himself.—O. J. Campbell.—*Harper's M*, 181: 172-85, July.

PEELE, GEORGE

217. Reed and Warton on *The Old Wives Tale*.—R. H. Wilson.—PMLA, 55: 605-08, June.
 217a. G. P.: *A Concise Bibliography*.—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y., pp. x, 36, \$3.25.

PLAYS & POEMS

Alf's Well (AW)

218. AW.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by R. Floethe.

Antony & Cleopatra

219. Janus in Alexandria.—D. B. Lyman.—Sewanee R, 48: 86-104, Jan.
 220. *Der dramatische Rhythmus in 'A & C.'* (Diss.)—R. Binder.—Würzburg, 1939, pp. 174.
See 350.

As You Like It (AY)

221. Jacques' 7 ages & Censorinus.—A. H. Gilbert.—MLN, 55: 103-05, Feb.
 222. 'AY'.—J. Smith.—Scrutiny, 9: 9-32, June.
 223. The names in AY—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 255-56, Oct.

Comedy of Errors (Errors)

224. Sh's map for *Errors*.—G. B. Parks.—JEGP, 39: 93-97, Jan.
See 192.

Coriolanus (Cor)

226. 'My gracious silence'.—D. Brown.—SAB, 15: 55-56, Jan.
See 350.

Cymbeline (Cy)

226. Cy.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n Club, ils by Y. Berg, \$5.
See 63.

Hamlet (H)

227. J. W. Draper's *The 'H' of Sh's Audience*.—R. A. Law.—JEGP, 39: 144-46, Jan.
 228. *Hamlet Had An Uncle* [A novel.]—B. Cabell.—N. Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, pp. xxiv + 272, ils, \$2.50.—L. Eshleman, N. Y. Times Book R, Jan. 28, p. 7.
 229. The F1 text of *H*.—C. L. Stainer.—TLS, Jan. 6, 1940, p. 7.
 230. Hamlet, Sr.—merchant or knight?—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 61-62, Jan.
 231. Meddling with Sh's text.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 62-64, Jan.
 232. The mouse-trap.—W. W. Greg.—MLR, 35: 8-10, Jan.
 233. Of men and angels.—C. B. Bourland.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, 21: 6-9.
 234. The mouse-trap again.—C. J. Sisson.—RES, 16: 129-36, Apr.

235. Parrott & Craig's ed'n of *H*.—P. Alexander.—MLR, 35: 232-34, Apr.
 236. Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia in the nunnery scene.—T. Sen.—MLR, 35: 145-52, Apr.
 237. 'Soliloquy on Hamlet.' [Poem]—A. Guterman.—SAB, 15: 94, Apr.
 238. Hamlet's 'sect & force'.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 125-26, Apr.
 239. *Der Hamlet Sh's*.—H. H. Glunz.—Frankfurt, pp. 70 RM 175.
 240. The sequence of scenes in *H*.—L. Kirschbaum.—MLN, 55: 382-87, May.
 241. Hamlet's 'antic disposition'.—M. E. Finch.—NQ, 179: 62-63, July 27.
 242. Schücking's *The Meaning of 'H.'*—M. E. Prior.—MP, 38: 106-08, Aug.
 243. A bit of Sh interpretation.—C. D. Stewart.—Wisconsin M of Hist., 23: 272-80, Mar.
 244. Prince Hamlet.—L. C. Knights.—Scrutiny, 9: 148-60, Sept.
 245. A reading of the play-scene.—J. M. Nosworthy.—Engl Studies, 22: 161-70, Oct.
 246. On artistic unity in *H*.—A. Bonjour.—Engl Studies, 21: 193-202, Oct, 1939
See 63, 71, 399.

Henry IV (H4)

247. Falstaff.—B. Martin.—Dalhousie R, 19: 439-81, Jan.
 248. A note on 2H4.—R. K. Alspach.—SAB, 15: 191-92, July.
 248a. H4 (Pt 2 A new variorum ed'n)—M. A. Shaaber, ed.—Phila.: J. B. Lippincott Co., pp. xx + 716, \$7. (Appendixes on the text, date of composition, sources, criticisms, the Dering ms., acting versions, stage history, bib.).

Henry V (H5)

249. H5.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by V: Willoughby.
See 171.

Henry VI (H6)

250. H6 (3 vols.)—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n Club, \$5. (Ils by J. Charlot.)

Julius Caesar (JC)

251. Brutus's forum-speech.—R. W. Zandvoort.—RES, 16: 62-66, Jan.

- 252 *Sh Studies*: JC.—B: Coles.—N. Y.: R. R. Smith, \$2.50.
 253. JC.—P. A. Gasper, ed.—Ln, pp. 90, 1s.
 See 350, 399.

King John (KJ)

254. Anglo-French relations in KJ.—M: Ash—*Études Anglaises*, 4: 349-58.
 255. KJ.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n's Club; ills by V. Angelo

King Lear (KL)

256. Montaigne's *Apologie* and KL (concluded).—W. B. D. Henderson.—SAB, 15: 40-54, Jan.
 257. Hebbel's study of KL.—P. G. Graham.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, 21: 81-90.
 258. KL [Collotype facs of Q1]—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.
 259. The staging of KL.—W. W. Greg. RES, 16: 300-03, July.
 260. Sh. & *King Lear*.—W. W. Greg.—TLS, Mar. 9, p. 124.
 261. The old age of Lear.—J. W. Draper.—JEGP, 39: 527-40, Oct.
 262. KL: *A Concise Bibliography* [1950 items].—S. A. Tannenbaum.—N. Y., pp. x + 102, \$5.50; only 300 copies.
 263. Time, place & politics in KL.—W. W. Greg.—MLR, 35: 431-46, Oct.
 264. 'Hause' & 'slave' in KL.—J. Sledd.—MLN, 55: 594-96, Dec.
 265. KL produced by the New School for Social Research.—J. B. Atkinson, N. Y. Times, Dec. 16.—R. Watts, Jr., N. Y. Herald, Dec. 16, p. 14
 266. The stage-history of KL. [MS. diss., 1939].—L. E. Derrick.—At the U of Texas.
 267. KL. The moral aspect.—J. M. Nosworthy.—Engl Studies, 21: 260-68, Dec., 1939.
 267a. Variants in Q1 of KL.—TLS, Nov. 16, p. 584.
 267b. *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'KL': A Bibliographical & Critical Inquiry*.—W. W. Greg.—Ln, 1940, pp. viii + 192.

Love's Labor's Lost (LLL)

268. Don Armado of the *Commedia dell'arte*.—D. C. Boughner.—SP, 37: 201-24, Apr.

269. On iv, iii, 285-362.—S. B. Wells.—MLN, 55: 102-03, Feb.

Macbeth (M)

270. M, I, ii.—F. Bajocchi.—TLS, Mar. 23, p. 147.
 271. M, I, ii.—G. N. Giordano-Orsini.—TLS, Apr. 6, p. 171.
 272. An emendation of IV, i, 52-53.—D. W. Thompson.—NQ, 179 118, Aug. 17.
 273. Copyhold tenure in III, ii, 38.—P. S. Clarkson & C. T. Warren.—MLN, 55: 483-93, Nov.
 274. The contemporary setting of M. [MS. diss.].—A. N. Stunz.—U of Iowa. See 399.

The Merchant of Venice (MV)

275. The Jew in Gentile fiction.—D: L. Hobman.—Contemporary R, 157: 97-103, Jan.
 276. The Neapolitan prince.—E: T. Clark.—News Letter: The Sh Fellowship, 1: 12, Feb.
 277. MV [Collotype facs of Q1]—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.
 278. The psychology of Shylock.—J. W. Draper.—B of the Hist of Medicine, 8: 643-50, Apr.
 279. MV. [With intr & notes]—H. W. Simon, ed.—N. Y.: Simon & Schuster, pp. lxvi, 146.
 280. A story for a dramatist.—C. Reznikoff.—Menorah J, 28: 269-78, Oct.
 281. 'A Daniel come to judgment.'—C. H. Gordon.—SAB, 15: 206-09, Oct.

Merry Wives (MW)

282. MW [1602, collotype facs]—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.
 See 63

Midsummer Night's Dream (MND)

283. Titania & the changeling.—D. C. Miller.—Engl Studies, 22: 66-70, Apr.

Much Ado About Nothing (MA)

284. MA.—H. Farneton, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n's Club, ills by F. Kredel, \$5.
 285. Spenser & MA.—A. Thaler.—SP, 37: 225-35, Apr.

Othello (O)

286. Shelley & Sh: *O & The Cenci*.—S: R. Watson—PMLA, 55: 611-14, June.
 287. A note on *O*—H: A. Kahin—Modern Language Q, 1: 475-79, Dec.
 288. Iago & the problem of time.—D. C. Muller.—Engl Studies, 22: 97-115, June. See 63, 71.
 288a. Signior Brabantio, plaintiff.—J. W. Draper.—Engl Studies, 22: 193-98, Dec.

Passionate Pilgrim (PP)

289. J. Q. Adams's ed'n of PP.—W. W. Greg, MLN, 55: 462-64, June—S. A. Tannenbaum, SAB, 15: 128, Apr.
 290. PP. [Facs. of 1612 ed'n, with intr & appendix.].—H. E. Rollins, ed.—N. Y.: Scribner's Sons, pp. xlii + [138], \$4

Pericles (Per)

291. *Per*.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by S. Ostoya-Chrostowski.

Richard II (R2)

292. J. D. Wilson's ed'n of R2.—F. E. C. H.—Baconiana, 24: 217-21 & 226-28, Oct., 1939
 293. R2.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by A. M. Parker.

Richard III (R3)

294. R3.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by F. Eichenberg
 295. A Tudor defense of Richard III.—W. G. Zeeveld—PMLA, 55: 946-57, Dec. See 399.

Romeo & Juliet (R&J)

296. 'R&J' as an Experimental Tragedy.—H. B. Charlton.—Ln: H. Milford (N. Y. OUP), pp. 46, 85c. (Repr. fr. *Proc. of the British Academy*, vol. 25.)
 297. 'Skains-Mate.'—W. W. Gill.—NQ, 179: 27, July 13.
 298. R&J.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by E. Metzl.
 299. Da Porto's deviations from Masuccio.—O. H. Moore.—PMLA, 55: 934-45, Dec. See 173.

Songs

300. *Under the Greenwood Tree*.—J: L. Reynolds, ed.—Oxford U P, ils by L. Weisgard, \$2.50.

Sonnets

301. *Sh's Sonnets. A Concise Bibliography*. [1637 items].—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y.: The compiler, pp. xii + 88, \$4.
 302. The structure of figurative language in the *S*s.—A. Mizener—Southern R, 5: 730-47, Apr.
 303. Light on the Dark Lady.—T. W. Baldwin; P. K. Angell—PMLA, 55: 598-602, June
 304. *The Story of Anne Hathaway & Wm. Shakspeare as revealed by the Sonnets & other Eliz'n poetry*.—W. Ross—Glasgow, 1939, pp. 232
 305. *Formal Designs from 10 Sh Sonnets*.—M. B. Pratt—[New Brunswick, N. J., 7 Bartlett Str], pp. [46], \$2.
 306. T. Brooke's ed'n of *Sh's Sonnets*.—H. Luedeke—Engl Studies, 22: 151-55, Aug. See 145

The Taming of the Shrew (TS)

307. The integrity of TS.—R. A. Houk.—JEGP, 39: 222-29, Apr.
 308. TS [Rus trn, adapted to the stage, with notes].—M. A. Kuzmin tr. (A. Popov & P. Urbanovich, edd.)—Moscow, pp. 168; R1.
 309. TS.—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by W. A. Dwiggins.
 310. TS' its relation to *A Shrew* and *Supposes*, with special reference to sequence & authorship. [MS. diss.].—E. S. Brenton—Raddcliffe Coll.
 311. The development of the 'induction' in the Engl drama, 1582-1642. [MS. diss., 1939.].—S. P. Olmsted—Yale U.

The Tempest (T)

312. Caliban, savage clown.—J. C. McCloskey—College English, 1: 354-57, Jan
 313. The Bulgarian origins of T.—H. Grégoire.—SP, 37: 236-56, Apr.
 314. Some notes on T.—A. H. King.—Engl Studies, 22: 70-74, Apr.

315. *T.*—P. A. Gasper, ed.—Ln, pp. 88, 1s.
 316. *T.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by E. A. Wilson.
 317. *A Discovery of the Bermudas (1610): With an Intr.*—S. Jourdain. (J. Q. Adams, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (103 Park Ave.), pp. [x + 26], \$2 (Facs reprint)
See 152, 153, 399.

Timon of Athens (*Timon*)

318. *Timon.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by G. Buday
 319. The authorship of *Timon.*—R. A. Haug—SAB, 15: 227-48, Oct.
 320. The psychology of *Timon.*—J. W. Draper—MLR, 35: 521-25, Oct.
See 350

Titus Andronicus (*Titus*)

321. *Titus.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by N. F. Lapshin.

Troilus & Cressida (*T&C*)

322. O. J. Campbell's *Comitall Satyre & T&C.*—A. Walker; RES, 16: 90-92, Jan.—A. Thaler, JEGP, 39: 282-84, Apr.—W. Schmidt, Beiblatt, 51: 13-18, Jan.
See 350.

Twelfth Night (*TN*)

323. *TN* at Webster Groves High-School. [*il.*].—Theatre Arts, 24: 218, Mar.
 324. *TN.*—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n Club; ils by F. Carnevali.
 325. H: Hayes & M. Evans in *TN.*—B. Atkinson, N. Y. Times, Nov. 20, p. 26.—R. Lockridge, N. Y. Sun, Nov. 20, p. 8.—J. M. Brown, N. Y. Eve. Post, Nov. 20, p. 6.—E. Jordan, America, Dec. 7, p. 250.—S A T., SAB, 15: 254-55.
 326. Three ils to *TN.*—Theatre Arts, 24: 846 & 898.
See 63, 192, 366.

Two Gentlemen of Verona (*TGV*)

327. *TGV*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Ltd Ed'n Club, ils by P. Brissaud, \$5.

Venus & Adonis

328. Notes on Sh's poems.—G. G. Loane.—NQ, 178: 188-89, May 16.

The Winter's Tale (*WT*)

329. *WT.*—N. Y.: Limited Ed'n Club, ils by A. Rutherford.
 330. The ancestry of Autolycus.—W. T. Hastings.—SAB, 15: 253, Oct.
 331. A classical vs. a social approach to Autolycus.—M. Y. Hughes.—SAB, 15: 219-26, Oct.

POETICS

332. The philosophy of poetry.—W. Hester.—The Personalist, 21: 61-72, Dec., 1939.
 333. The nature of the lyric.—B. G. Brooks—19th Century, 127: 78-86, Jan.
 334. A course in poetics.—P. Valéry. (J. Mathews, tr.)—Southern R, 5: 401-18, Jan.
 335. *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot.*—F O. Matthiessen.—N. Y.: OUP, \$1.50.
 336. The source of poetry.—P. Engle.—College Engl, 1: 471-80, Mar.
 337. On the semantics of poetry.—P. Wheelwright.—Kenyon R, 2: 263-83, July.
 338. J. Bronowski's *The Poet's Defence.* J B Leishman.—RES, 16: 369-72, July.
 339. *New Poets from Old: A Study in Literary Genetics.*—H. W. Wells.—N. Y.: Columbia U P, pp. xii + 356. \$3.50.
 340. Christian poetry.—L. Aaronson.—19th Century, 128: 182-88, Aug.
 341. The value of poetry in the social order.—J. M. Murry.—Aryan Path, 11: 439-42, Sept.
 342. Poetry & the passions.—E. E. Stoll.—PMLA, 55: 979-92, Dec.
 343. *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden.* [With notes]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—N. Y.: Amer. Book Co, pp. xii + 704, hih, front, \$4.
 344. Keble on great poetry.—E. Lyttelton.—Hubbert J, 39: 74-82, Oct.
 345. Understanding poetry.—B. Deutsch.—Amer. Scholar, 10: 67-71, Dec.
 346. Romantic theories of poetry & criticism. [MS. diss.]—M. H. Abrams.—Harvard U.
 347. The essence & function of poetry. [MS. diss.]—D. H. Kyes.—Poetry R, 31: 319-20, July.
 348. Aspects of Tegnér's views concern-

ing poetry.—A. M. Sturtevant.—Scandinavian Studies, 16. 68-70, May.

349. Realism in Engl poetry.—V. de Sola Pinto.—*Essays & Studies . . of the Engl Ass'n*, pp. 81-100.

POLITICS

350. *The State in Sh's Greek & Roman Plays*.—J. E. Phillips, Jr.—N. Y.: Columbia U P, pp. xii + 230, bib., \$2.75. See 254.

PREDECESSORS

351. The authorship of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*.—C. W. Roberts.—PQ, 19. 97-113, Apr.
352. G. Scheuerwegh's ed'n of *Roister Doister*.—R. H. Bowers.—MLN, 55 476-78, June.

PROSE

353. English prose style in trns from the classics, 1489-1580. [Ms. diss.].—J. L. Wortham.—Princeton U.

PUBLISHING

354. '*Ad imprimendum solum*'.—B. Shapin.—MLR, 35: 207-11, Apr.

QUARTOS

355. Sh quartos in collotype facs.—J. G. McManaway.—MLN, 55: 632-34, Dec.

RALEIGH, WALTER

356. Sir W. R. on natural philosophy.—E. A. Strathmann.—MLQ, 1. 49-61, Mar.
357. *The Hist of the World* and R's scepticism.—E. A. Strathmann.—HLQ, 3: 265-87, Apr.
358. W R. in verse.—R. B M.—Devon & Cornwall Notes & Queries, 21:41, Jan.
359. Venice & Engl political thought in the 17th century.—Z. S. Fink.—MP, 38: 155-72, Apr.
360. R's *Eden*. [A novel.].—I. Fletcher.—N. Y.: Bobbs-Merrill, \$2.75.
361. W. R.'s farewell to his wife.—A. M. C. Lacham.—*Essays & Studies . . of the Engl Ass'n*, pp. 39-58.

RELIGION

362. The significance of religious writings in the Engl Renaissance.—L. B. Wright.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 59-68, Jan.

363. The Eliz'n sermon: a survey & bibliography. [MS diss.].—A. F. Herr.—U of Pa.

RUSSIA

364. Sh in the USSR.—J. Gury.—Amer Q of the Soviet Union, 2 45-59, July, 1939
365. How we study Sh.—M. M. Moizov.—Sovietland, 9. 34, June.

RUTLAND-SH MATTER

366. *Sh Unmasked*.—P. S. Porohovshikov.—N. Y., pp. 304, 6 pls & 8 facs.

SCIENCE

367. Wm. Sh., botanist.—P. Cook.—SAB, 15. 149-65, July.

SIDNEY, PHILIP

368. Manuscripts of S's *Arcadia*.—M. Beese.—TLS, May 4, p. 224
369. *The Defense of Poetrie*. [With notes].—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (N. Y. Amer Book Co.), pp. 404-61
370. The rhetoric of S's *Arcadia*. [MS diss.].—P. McN. Miller, Jr.—Princeton U.
371. The influence of Plato on S's *Defense of Poesy*.—I. Samuel.—Modern Language Q, 1 383-91, Sept

SPENSER, EDMUND

372. Canto unity in *FQ*.—W. F. McNeill.—PQ, 19. 79-87, Jan.
373. Wordsworth's view on the state of Ireland.—E. W. Marjoram.—PMLA, 55: 608-11, June
374. 'Hobgoblin runne away with the garland of Apollo'.—S. Thomas.—MLN, 55 418-22, June
375. Three imitations of Sp.—J. N. Hook.—MLN, 55 431-32, June
376. A Fraunce & Sp.—K. Koller.—ELH, 7 108-20, June.
377. E. K.'s reference to painting.—F. Hard.—ELH, 7. 121-29, June
378. Keats & Sp again.—C. B. Burke.—PQ, 19: 149-50, Apr.
379. Sp's Malengin & the rogue-book Hooker.—B. Milligan.—PQ, 19: 147-48, Apr.

380. Sp & some pictorial conventions, with particular reference to illuminated manuscripts.—R. Tuve.—SP, 37: 149-76, Apr.

381. The allegory of Sir Artegall.—J. W. Bennett.—SP, 37: 177-200, Apr.

382. Ascham's *Scholemaster* & Sp's February Eclogue.—S. Rosenzweig.—SAB, 15: 103-09, Apr.

383. D. F. Atkinson's bibliography of Sp.—D. Hamer.—RES, 16: 338-40, July.

384. Queries fr Sp.—G. G. L.—NQ, 178: 445-46, June 22.

385. A study of Sp.—Viglione.—TLS, Apr. 13, p. 183.

386. Sp's brother-in-law.—W. H. Welply.—NQ, 179: 92-96 (Aug. 10), 112-14 (Aug. 17).

387. Sp's brother-in-law.—E. S. J. Brooks.—NQ, 179: 139, Aug. 24.

388. The psychology of Anamnestes.—B. T. Stewart.—Modern Language Q, 1: 193-94, June.

389. *A Study of Sp's Gentleman*.—J. L. Shanley.—Evanston: The author.

390. Sp's 'House of Temperance'.—V. F. Hopper.—PMLA, 55: 958-67, Dec.

391. Letter to W. Raleigh [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, pp. 462-65.

392. The background of *Prothalamion*. [MS. diss.]—D. S. Norton.—Princeton U.

393. Allegory & FQ. [MS. diss.]—J. McClenen.—Harvard U.

394. The influence of Sp on Shelley's major poetry. [MS. diss.]—C. H. Baker.—Princeton U.
See 285.

STAGE HISTORY

395. *Annals of the N. Y. Stage*. [Vol. 12].—G. C. D. Odell.—N. Y.: Columbia UP., pp. xx + 734, 330 ils, \$8.75.
See 3.

STAGING

396. Sh'n staging in London from Irving to Gielgud. [MS. diss.]—C. D. Linton.—Johns Hopkins U.

397. Some recent trends in Shn staging.—C. D. Linton.—ELH, 7: 300-24, Dec.
See 92, 274.

STRATFORD

398. John Sh, corvizer, of Stratford-on-Avon & the Balsall Shakespeares.—R. Taylor.—PMLA, 55: 721-26, Sept.

SUPERNATURAL

399. An examination of Sh's use of the supernatural.—C. Burcham.—Research, Jan., 1939, pp. 14-32.

TEACHING

400. Use of phonographic recordings in teaching Sh.—S. Wengarten.—College Engl, 1: 45-61, Oct. 1939.

401. How helpful are Sh recordings?—W. Ginsberg.—Engl J, 29: 289-300, Apr., 1940.

402. New methods in teaching Sh.—E. H. Sauer.—Ohio Schools, 18: 162-63, Apr., 1940.

403. Sh in primary schools.—Times Educational Suppl't, 1258: 229, June 10, 1939.
See 196.

TECHNIQUE

404. The use of rhyme in Sh's plays. [MS. diss, 1939.]—F. W. Ness.—Yale U.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

405. R. B. McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Sh*.—J. B. Leishman; RES, 16: 92-95, Jan.—J. Wilcox; SAB, 15: 59-60, Jan.—R. W. Zandvoort; Engl Studies, 21: 169-71, Aug, 1939.

406. Standard emendations of Sh.—W. H. J.—NQ, 179: 388-89, Nov. 30.

TOURNEUR, CYRIL

407. C. T. & *The Transformed Metamorphosis*.—K. N. Cameron.—RES, 16: 18-24, Jan.

TRAGEDY

408. The shackling of accidents: a study of Eliz'n tragedy.—H. Craig.—PQ, 19: 1-19, Jan.

409. Tragedy.—U: Ellis-Fermor.—English, 3: 84-86, July.

410. *De l'art de la tragédie* by J. de la Taille; ed. by F. West.—B. Weinberg.—MP, 38: 216-17, Nov.

411. Various essays on tragedy, comedy & drama. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, *passim*
 412. The theory of tragedy as history in renaissance & neo-classical criticism. [MS. diss.]—G. Giovannini—U of Michigan.

VERSIFICATION

413. *The grammar of rimes*.—T. W. Herbert.—Sewanee R, 48: 362-77, July.
See 87, 122.

WEBSTER, JOHN

414. J. W.'s address to the reader in *The White Devil*. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism*, p 551.

WOMEN

415. A warning-piece against Sh's women —A. M. Sampley.—SAB, 15: 34-39, Jan.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occurring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics
for 1940*

Compiled by RALPH P. ROSENBERG

A

- Aaronson, L., 340
 Abrams, M. H., 346
 Abstracts, 2
 Acting and Actors, 75, 97, 100, 144, 150, 159
 Adams, J. Q., 25, 208, 289, 317
 Adaptations, 213
 Adkins, M. G. M., 113
 Aesthetics, 107, 332-49
 Aiken, J. R., 174
 Alexander, P., 235
 Allegory, 381, 393
Alf's Well, 218
 Alspach, R. K., 248
 America, Sh and, 3-4, 152, 323, 325
 Angell, P. K., 303
 Angelo, V., 255
 Anthology, 5
 Antony, A. G., 45
Antony and Cleopatra, 41, 219-20, 350
 Apocrypha, 6
 Anosto, Ludovico, 104
 Arnold, O., 42
 Artegall, Sir, 381
 Arther, J., 17
 Ascham, Roger, 382
 Ash, M.: 254
As You Like It, 52, 221-23, 300
 Atheism, 177
 Atkinson, B., 325
 Atkinson, D. F., 383
 Atkinson, J. B., 265
 Authorship problems, 7-8, 29, 90, 310, 319

B

- Bacon, Francis, 9-11
 Bacon-Sh imbroglia, 12-15, 28, 29
 Bacon, W. A., 76
 Bajocchi, F., 270
 Baker, C. H., 394
 Baker, H., 69
 Baldwin, T. W., 64, 70, 303
 Bale, John, 16-17
Barmudas, A Discovery of the, 317
 Barrell, C. W., 214-15
 Bartlett, H. C., 25
 Bates, S. C., 40
 Baudelaire, Charles, 138
 Baugh, A. C., 24
 Baym, M. I., 138
 Beaumont and Fletcher, 18-19
 Beer, E. S. de, 81
 Beese, M., 368
 Bennett, J. W., 381
 Bennett, R. E., 117
 Berg, Y., 226
 Bible, 20-21, 281
 Bibliography, 22-27, 64, 82, 89, 94, 139, 175, 176, 185, 262, 301, 363, 383
 Binder, R., 220
 Biography, 28-37, 62, 304, 398
 Birds, 36, 37
 Blundeville, T., 108
 Boas, F. S., 179, 182
 Bodin, Jean, 162
 Bonjour, A., 246
 Book titles from Sh, 38-57
 Botany, Sh and, 367
 Boughner, D. C., 268
 Bourland, C. B., 148, 233
 Bowen, E. W., 137
 Bowers, D.: 54
 Bowers, F. T., 91, 98
 Bowers, R. H., 352
 Boyd, M. C., 207
 Boydell Sh, The, 199
 Brenton, E. S., 310
 Breton, Nicholas, 58
 Breton, William, 58
 Bright, T., 190

*Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the baptismal name. Sh = Shakspeare.

Brissaud, P., 327
 Bronowski, J., 338
 Brooke, T., 306
 Brooks, B. G., 333
 Brooks, E. S. J., 387
 Brooks, P., 197, 200
 Brophy, J., 135
 Brown, D., 225
 Brown, J. L., 162
 Brown, J. M., 325
 Brown, M., 116
 Bryant, M. M., 174
 Buday, G., 318
 Buffum, I., 205
 Bulgaria, Sh and, 313
 Bullough, G., 146
 Burcham, C., 399
 Burke, C. B., 378
 Burt, K. B., 49
 Burton, Robert, 136

C

C, T C, 144
 Cabell, B., 228
 Cadwalader, J., 6
 Cameron, E., 55
 Cameron, K. N., 407
 Campbell, I. B., 102
 Campbell, O. J., 216, 322
 Campion, E., 155
 Canada, Medieval and Renaissance
 manuscripts in, 22
 Carew, Thomas, 212
 Carnevali, F., 324
 Carrick, E., 146
 Castelnovo-Tedesco, M., 210
 Censorinus, 221
 Chamberlain, J., 79
 Chambers, E. K., 34
 Chapman, George, 59
 Charles II, 165
 Charlot, J., 250
 Charlton, H. B., 296
 Chester, Robert, 85
 China, Sh and, 8
 Chinese philosophy, 8
 Chronicle history, 168
 Clark, E. T., 125, 276

Clarkson, P. S., 273
 Classics, 157, 353
 Classics, Sh's knowledge of, 125
 Coleridge, Samuel T., 74
 Coles, B., 252
 Comedy, 60-61, 411
Comedy of Errors, 44, 192, 224
 Commedia dell'arte, 268
 Commentary, 31, 35, 62-77
 Contemporaries, 78-86
 Contemporary drama, 27, 34, 87-101
 Contemporary poetry, 102-07
 Contemporary prose, 108-10
 Contemporary setting, 263, 274
 Cook, P., 367
 Cooper, James F., 152
 Copyhold tenure, 273
 Corbin, J., 73
Coriolanus, 225, 350
 Craig, H., 26, 190, 235, 408
 Craig, H. S., 124
 Credulity, 130
 Criticism, 75
 Crundell, H. W., 184
 Cunningham, W. McC., 13
 Curry, W. C., 70
Cymbeline, 63, 226

D

Daniels, R. B., 105
 Da Porto, Luigi, 299
 Dark Lady, 303
 Davenant, William, 107, 111-12
 Davis, B. E. C., 146
 Dekker, Thomas, 113-14
 De Ricci, S., 22
 Dernick, L. E., 266
 Deutsch, B., 345
 Dick, H. G., 88, 108
 Dictionaries, 170
 Dodds, M. H., 20, 30, 144
 Donne, John, 106, 115-22
 Doran, M., 130
 Dottridge, G., 155a
 Drake, Sir Francis, 86
 Drama, 66, 67, 68, 87-101, 122, 213, 411
Drama, Annals of English, 27
 Dramatic rhythm 220

INDEX TO BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1940

Dramatic romances, Sh's, 76
 Dramatic technique, 240, 246, 288
 Draper, J. W., 227, 261, 278, 288a, 321
 Drayton, Michael, 123, 160, 163
 Dryden, John, 106, 119, 343
 Du Bois, A. E., 61
 Dueling, 124
 Du Maurier, A. 50
 Dwiggins, W. A., 309

E

Eccles, M., 19
 Education, 125
 Edward II, 184
 Edwards, A. C., 147
 Eichenberg, F., 294
 Einarsson, S., 1
 Eliot, S. A., Jr., 159
 Eliot, Thomas S., 335
 Elisabeth, Queen, 126
 Ellis-Fermor U: 179, 409
 Emendations, *See* Textual criticism
 Engle, P., 336
 Ennis, L: 83
 Environment, 127-34
 Eshleman, L., 228
 Evans, G. B., 112
 Evans, Maurice, 325
 Ewen, C. L. E., 32
 Ewing, S. B., 130

F

Facsimiles, 35, 109, 155, 190, 258, 277,
 282, 290, 317, 355
 Falk, R. P., 4
 Farjeon, H., 218, 226, 249, 250, 284, 291,
 293-94, 298, 309, 316, 318, 320, 327
 Fatout, P., 65
Faust Book, 178
 Ferguson, W. K., 131
 Fiction, 275, 360
 Fictionised, 135, 228
 Finch, M. E., 241
 Fink, Z. S., 359
 Fitzsimmons, C., 57
 Fletcher, I., 360
 Fletcher, John, 18-19
 Floethe, R., 218
 Flourmay, F., 58

Folio, First, 197, 200, 229
 Fools in Sh, 63
 Ford, John, 96, 136
 Forgeries, 6, 28, 86, 137, 183
 Frame, D. M., 206
 France, Sh and, 138-39, 254, 256
 Fraunce, A., 376
 Funke, O., 161

G

Gammer Gurton's Needle, 351
 Garnick, David, 75
 Gascoigne, George, 58, 140
 Gasper, P. A., 253, 315
 Gassner, J., 67, 93
 Gentleman, Spenser's, 389
 Geography in Sh, 224, 317
 Germany, Sh and, 141-42a, 257
 Ghosts, 143-44
 Gielgud, John, 396
 Gilbert, A. H., 59, 150, 166, 188, 221.
 343, 369, 391, 411, 414
 Gill, W. W., 297
 Ginsberg, W., 401
 Giordano-Orsini, G. N., 271
 Giovannini, G., 412
 Glunz, H. H., 239
 Gómara, F. L. de, 109
 Goodacre, E. B., 8, 85
 Gordon, C. H., 281
 Gorrell, R. M., 99
 Gottfried, R. B., 155
 Graham, P. G., 257
 Grain engrossers, 201
 Grammar, 19, 161, 413
 Greek, Sh's knowledge of, 125
 Greek plays, Sh's, 350
 Greene, Robert, 145, 182
 Greet, B., 194
 Greg, W. W., 25, 94, 232, 259, 260, 263,
 289
 Grégoire, H., 313
 Greville, Fulke, 146-47
 Gronauer, G., 143
 Grubbs, H. A., 164
 Guérard, A., 68
 Guiterman, A., 237
 Gulls in Sh, 63
 Gury, J., 364

H

- H, F. E. C., 292
 Hale, J. P., 42
 Hamer, D., 383
Hamlet, 38, 47, 57a, 63, 71, 227-46, 399
 Harbage, A., 27, 96
 Hard, F., 377
 Hardy, Thomas, 151
 Harrington, John, 104
 Harris, J. W., 16
 Harrison, G. B., 2, 97
 Harvey, Gabriel, 84, 148
 Hastings, W. T., 330
 Haug, R. A., 319
 Hayes, Helen, 325
 Healy, T. F., 154
 Hebbel, Friedrich, 257
 Henderson, W. B. D., 256
Henry IV, 247-48
Henry V, 171, 249
Henry VI, 250
 Henshaw, M., 24
 Herbert, T. W., 413
 Herod and Mariamne tragedies, 87
 Heron-Allen, E., 14
 Herr, A. F., 173, 363
 Hernick, Robert, 107, 149, 157
 Hester, W., 332
 Heywood, Thomas, 150
 Hinman, C., 114
 Hinton, E. M., 80
 Hobman, D. L., 275
 Holland, Philemon, 82
 Holmes, H. H., 51
 Hook, J. N., 375
 Hopper, V. F., 390
 Horses, Sh's allusions to, 65
 Houghton, R. E. C., 60
 Houk, R. A., 307
 Hudson, H. H., 102
 Hughes, M. Y., 331
 Huhner, M., 191
 Humanism, 134
 Hutchinson, P., 179
 Hyma, A., 134

I

- Iceland, Sh and, 1
 Illuminated manuscripts, 380
 Illustrations, 326
 Imitations, Spenser, 375
 Influence, 134, 136, 145, 151-53, 157, 162, 164, 286, 359, 371, 394
 Innes, M., 44
 Ireland, 373
 Ireland, Sh and, 154-56
 Irving, Henry, 396
 Italy, Sh and, 156, 299

J

- J, W. H., 406
 Jaggard, W., 8, 33, 180
 Jews, 275
 Johnson, P. H., 48
 Jonas, L., 107
 Jones, Inigo, 81
 Jones, O. F., 142a
 Jones, Robert, 208
 Jonson, Ben, 97, 107, 157-67
 Jordan, E., 325
 Jourdain, Sylvester, 317
Julius Caesar, 57, 251-53, 350, 399

K

- K, E., 377
 K, H. G. L., 144
 Kahn, H. A., 287
 Kastendieck, M. M., 212
 Keats, John, 378
 Keble, John, 344
 Keller, I. C., 203
 Kepler, Johannes, 118
 King, A. H., 314
King John, 42, 254-255
King Lear, 46, 50, 90, 256-67
 Kirschbaum, L., 240
 Knights, L. C., 244
 Kocher, P. H., 177-78, 181
 Kohn, H., 129
 Koller, K., 376
 Kredel, F., 284
 Kuzmin, M. A., 308
 Kyd, Thomas, 168-69
 Kyes, D. H., 347

L

- L, G. G., 384
Landrum, G. W., 198
Language, 170-74, 264, 337
Lapshin, N. F., 320
Latham, A. M. C., 361
Law, R. A., 227
Leavis, F. R., 74
Le Brun collection of Montaigne, 205
Leech, C., 165, 187
Leishman, J. B., 338, 405
Letters, 79, 117, 183, 391
Lewis, R. B., 35
Limited Editions Club's Sh, 226, 249-50,
255, 284, 291, 293-94, 298, 309, 316,
318, 321, 324, 327, 329
Linton, C. D., 396-97
Loane, G. G., 149, 328
Lockridge, R., 325
Lodge, Thomas, 97, 175
Lord Chamberlain's Company, The, 159
Love's Labor's Lost, 268-69
Luedeke, H., 306
Lyly, John, 176
Lyman, D. B., 219
Lyttelton, E., 344

M

- M, R. B., 358
Macbeth, 45, 51, 54-56, 270-74, 399
Machiavelli, Niccolo, 156, 182
Macurdy, G., 43
Malengin, 379
Manuscripts, 22, 368, 380
Marjarum, E. W., 373
Mark, M., 66
Marlowe, Christopher, 97, 177-84
Marston, John, 185
Martin, B., 247
Marx, M., 122
Massinger, Philip, 186-89
Masuccio, 299
Mathews, J., 334
Matthiessen, F. O., 335
Maynard, T., 126
McClennen, J., 393
McCloskey, J. C., 312
McClure, N. E., 79

- McEuen, K. A., 157
McKerrow, R. B., 102, 128, 405
McManaway, J. G., 111, 355
McNeal, T. H., 145
McNeely, S. S., 110
McNeir, W. F., 372
McQuigg, K. D., 155a
Medicine, 190-93
Medieval manuscripts, 22
Melsome, W. S., 12
Merchant of Venice, 40, 43, 275-81
Merry Wives of Windsor, 63, 282
Metaphysical poetry, 119
Metzl, E., 298
Meyerstein, E. H. W., 183
Michelmores, G. W., 194
Middle-class culture, 127
Midsummer Night's Dream, 283
Miles, L. W., 77
Miller, D. C., 283
Miller, P. McN., Jr., 370
Millican, C. B., 127
Milligan, B., 95, 201, 379
Miscellanea, 194-204
Mitchell, R. C., 56
Mizener, A., 21, 302
Montaigne, Michel de, 205-06, 256
Mooney, E. A., Jr., 153
Moore, H. T., 202
Moore, O. H., 299
Morozov, M. M., 365
Motherwell, 18
Mouse-trap, 232, 234, 245
Much Ado About Nothing, 284-85
Müller, J., 141
Muller, D. C., 288
Murry, J. M., 341
Music, 207-13

N

- Names in *Sh*, 223
Nationalism, 129
Natural philosophy, 356
Ness, F. W., 404
Newfoundland, *Sh* and, 172
New School for Social Research, 265
Nichols, M. G., 46
Nicolson, M., 118

Tragedy, 69, 87, 91, 98, 122, 147, 296,
408-13
Translations, 35, 104, 142a, 308, 353
Traversi, D. A., 156
Titius and Cressida, 322, 350
Tuve, R., 380
Twelfth Night, 63, 192, 323-26, 366
Twins and twinning, Sh's knowledge
of, 192
Two Gentlemen of Verona, 327
Tyson, I.: 196

U

United States, Medieval and Renaissance
manuscripts in, 22
Urbanovich, P., 308

V

Valency, M. J., 87
Valéry, P., 334
Van Druten, J., 38
Vandiver, E. P., Jr., 152
Variorum editions, 248a
Venetian justice, 158
Venus and Adonis, 328
Versification, 87, 122, 413
Viglione, 385

W

Walker, A. 322
Walsh, G., 192
Walters, M.: 9
Warren, C. T., 273
Warton, Thomas, 217
Wasserman, E. R., 18, 103
Watson, S. R., 286
Watts, R., Jr., 265
Weber, C. J., 151
Webster Groves High School, 323

Webster, John, 414
Weinberg, B., 410
Weingarten, S., 400
Weisgard, L., 300
Wells, H. W., 89, 339
Wells, S. B., 269
Wells, W., 90, 168, 169
Welply, W. H., 386
West, F., 410
Whately, Anne, 304
Wheelwright, P., 337
White, F. C., 33
Whitstone, George, 102
Wilcox, J., 405
Wiley, M.: L., 121
Will, S. F., 139
Will, Sh's, 28
Williams College, 197, 200
Williams, F. B., 128
Williamson, G., 120
Willoughby, V., 249
Wilson, E. A., 316
Wilson, J. D., 132, 292
Wilson, R. H., 217
Wilson, W. J., 22
Winter's Tale, The, 329-31
Witchcraft, 181
Women, 415
Wordsworth, William, 373
Wortham, J. L., 353
Wright, G. W., 15
Wright, L. B., 78, 127, 362

Z

Zandvoort, R. W., 251, 405
Zeeveld, W. G., 295

Brooklyn and Hunter Colleges
(Ext. Div.)

IN DEFENSE OF BASSANIO

By J. M. ARIAIL

IN her article, *Bassanio the Elizabethan Lover*,¹ Miss Helen Pettigrew has prefaced her thesis with an adequate summary of the "accusatory chorus" of scholars who have expressed the feeling of the inferiority of Bassanio to Portia. Notwithstanding her purpose to show that Bassanio is clearly intended for the hero of the play, and that he is a realistic Elizabethan gentleman, quite worthy of the noble Portia, the author admits that Bassanio's behavior, for a hero, does seem rather odd, and she proceeds to enumerate sufficient weaknesses to leave him upon a pretty low level. In thus joining the detractors of Bassanio, Miss Pettigrew makes more striking and effective her restoration and elevation of the lover, but in her zeal for her idea she does unwarrantable violence to the text and reduces Bassanio to a level of degradation that is unfair to him, and from which not even Shakspeare could lift him.

Miss Pettigrew says: "As a husband, Bassanio's only acts are to use Portia's money as freely as his own, and later to break word with her, and then to lie about the ring." In Bassanio's defense I wish to examine this statement in the light of the text of the play.

Whatever may have been the motives of Bassanio as he planned his wooing and before he saw Portia, it is clear that after he came into her presence he was genuinely in love.

When Portia says:

"Then confess

What treason there is mingled with your love,"

he replies:

"None but that ugly treason of mistrust

Which makes me fear the enjoying of my love."

" 'Confess' and 'love'

Had been the very sum of my confession."

In the casket scene, his bitter speech on gold reveals a changed motive and may have been intended in part to indicate such a change. When he has won, it is Portia who, in one of her loveliest speeches, wishes herself a thousand times more fair and ten thousand times more rich for his sake, and reminds him that her house and her possessions are all his. In reply to this, Bassanio declares that she has bereft him of all words and left only joy, but in expressing this he does not refer to the gift of worldly goods. Apparently, then, these things are no longer as they were at the beginning of the quest.

When, a little later in the same scene, ill news comes from Antonio, Bassanio turns pale with grief and shock, but there is no word that hints that he sees, even in a flash of thought or an aside, any way out with Portia's money. In fact, he steps apart to read the letter and seems to make a sincere effort to keep Portia from learning its contents. In response to her charming plea to know the trouble he frankly states his poverty and explains thereby the loan, but there is not the slightest suggestion that her or their money should repay it. Indeed, before such a thought could form Salerio heads it off by stating that the Jew would not take the money if Antonio had it, and this is emphatically confirmed by Jessica.

When Portia, by direct inquiry, learns the amount of money due, it is she who says:

"Pay him six thousand, and deface the bond.
Double six thousand and then treble that
Before a friend of this description
Shall lose a hair through Bassanio's fault.
First go with me to church and call me wife,
And then away to Venice to your friend!

 You shall have gold
To pay the petty debt twenty times over.
When it is paid bring your true friend along."

Undoubtedly, Bassanio took the money along, for Portia checks on it several times during the court scene. True, he offers "thrice" the debt, but this is far less than Portia instructed him to offer. He attempts to give the Civil Doctor

the amount of the original bond, which if taken might have been repaid by Antonio, who had by this time the refusal of one-half of Shylock's wealth. There is no evidence further in the play that Bassanio did not return the unspent money, or that he ever spent Portia's money "freely" or even at all. Miss Pettigrew's first charge, then, is not only not substantiated by the text but also fails to do justice to one of Portia's loveliest moments by taking from her generous nature the lead in the whole money relationship.

As to the charge that Bassanio broke his word to Portia, there can be no dispute. But the manner in which he did it cannot be treated aside from the text. If ever a man tried to keep faith in a tight spot it was Bassanio. He confesses the truth that the ring is his wife's gift and reveals his vow. He holds out until Antonio's plea that the ring be given "against his wife's commandment." He insists that the gift was "enforced"—by friendship and by honor—thereby tacitly refusing to admit that he had broken faith. Surely, if a man ever kept the spirit of his word with his wife it was he.

The final charge made by Miss Pettigrew—"to lie about the ring"—I feel is entirely unsubstantiated by the text. Yet she rather insists upon this, saying: "The ring episode, too, occurs in *Il Pecorone*, but there only one ring is involved, and the hero does not attempt, when charged with having given his ring away, to prevaricate." "Shakespeare, then, added to his source nearly all of Bassanio's distinctive characteristics, unpleasant and otherwise"—among the former the characteristic of lying.

I confess I cannot find one slight deviation from the truth, either in fact or in spirit, in the words of Bassanio from the moment when Portia asks, "What ring gave you, my Lord," until he speaks his last words in the play. True, his first impulse is to prevaricate.

"Why I were best to cut my left hand off
And swear I lost the ring defending it."

But he does not do it. He says, simply and honestly:

"If I could add a lie unto a fault,
I would deny it; but you see my finger
Hath not the ring upon it — it is gone."

And then follows the simple truth, corroborated by the serious and sincere Antonio.

Miss Pettigrew's article is important and highly interesting, but the ablest thesis is weakened if Shakspeare's words do not support the cause. Unquestionably, Bassanio suffers enough in contrast with the incomparable Portia. But may we not say at this period of his work Shakspeare was more interested in his heroines than in their lovers, and that he isolates them and concentrates upon them frequently at the expense of the latter? Romeo crumples up and becomes a poor sport just as Juliet takes the lead; Orlando is scarcely a worthy match for Rosalind; Beatrice has depths unfathomed by the shallow Benedict, and Olivia is surrounded by a troop of sorry fellows. Bassanio, not quite so unworthy as Miss Pettigrew makes him, fares fairly well—but apparently Shakspeare was more interested in Portia.

*Columbia College,
South Carolina.*

¹Helen Pettigrew: "Bassanio the Elizabethan Lover." *P. Q.*, XVI (July, 1937), pp 296-306.

I KNOW A HAWK FROM A HANDSAW

By HALDEEN BRADY

AMONG the wild and whirling words that young Prince Hamlet employs to mystify his auditors and convince them of his madness, none is more puzzling than in Act II, scene ii, lines 360-61: "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw." Although Hamlet's allusion to the "hawk" and the "handsaw" seems perfectly admissible in implying that he is discerning in being able to distinguish one object (a bird) from another (a carpenter's tool), Shaksperian scholars in general have not been inclined to accept the statement at face value. Before attempting to treat the problem from a fresh angle, it may be well to review, from notes in the *Furness Variorum*¹ the interpretations which have won attention.

In 1744 Hanmer suggested emending "handsaw"² to "heronsew, -shew, -shaw," in order that the expression might read "I know a hawk from a hernshaw," *i.e.*, a hawk from a heron. This reading has received wide recognition and is approved by some editors of the present day; but unfortunately for those critics who would have the hawk symbolize the north wind and the heron the south wind, or have the passage relate to the behaviour of the birds in the sport of falconry,³ this suggested emendation is not supported by such evidence as would warrant acceptance. The words "handsaw" and "hernshaw" appear to be without any etymological relation whatever. The inappropriateness of this emendation was, indeed, recognized by a few early commentators; but—again unfortunately—at least one or two of these who accepted "handsaw" felt obliged to conjecture, with reference to "hawk," that there was in Elizabethan England a hooked cutting tool called a hawk. But this can hardly be established; the *New English Dictionary* records no instance of this meaning for "hawk" before the year 1700.

Hamlet's statement makes good sense as it stands, and thus would appear altogether satisfactory, especially since

there seems to be no conclusive datum to the contrary. In point of fact, there are in the Anglo-Saxon language⁴ proverbial phrases markedly similar to the Prince's claim that he knows "a hawk from a handsaw." Perhaps the most surprising feature of Hamlet's wording is the choice of the affirmative or positive;⁵ for these old saws are most frequently in the negative. When in the negative these antique sayings are generally euphemisms for stupidity. Examples may be cited from sources ready at hand:

1. I know not an A from the Windmylne (year 1401, *NED*).
2. He does not know a great A from the gable end of a house (1830, Apperson).⁶
3. I know not . . . a B from a bole foot (1401, *NED*).
4. He . . . knewe not a letter, or a B from a bateldore (1565, Apperson).
5. Hardly one of them could tell J from a bandy stick (late 19th cent.).⁷

Then there are numerous similar phrases in current speech:

6. He don't know beef from bull's foot.⁸
7. He doesn't know a woodcock from a turkey
8. He don't know a hog from a side-saddle.
9. He don't know his foot from a hole in the ground.⁹
10. I didn't know him from Adam's off-ox¹⁰

And Apperson¹¹ adds the following variations of Hamlet's own words:

11. He knows not a hawk from a handsaw (1703, Centlivre, *Stolen Herress*, III, iv).
12. I have heard the proverb, 'He doesn't know a hawk from a handsaw' (1912, R. L. Gales, *Studies in Arcady*, 2d ser., 24).
13. I suspect 'Charlie' . . . could not tell a hawk from a handsaw, even when the wind was southerly (1920, Barbellion, *Last Diary*, 54).

There appears ample reason to conclude that Hamlet's wording belongs to the same genre as the foregoing proverbial sayings and that it should be interpreted as it is written: "I know a hawk from a handsaw." But it might be argued that inasmuch as "he don't know beef from bull's foot" seems to be a corruption of "I know not . . . a B from

a bole foot," similarly "I know a hawk from a handsaw" is a corruption of "I know a hawk from a hernshaw." However, the fact is that there appears to be no instance of "I know a hawk from a heronsew" as a proverbial saying. "Heronsew" thus appears an entirely unwarranted emendation. But even if a phrase linking *hawk* with *heronsew* should be found, this would by no means affect the important circumstance that Shakspeare wrote and meant "handsaw," just as today one says and means "beef," not "B." Hamlet is not completely mad; when the wind is southerly (*i.e.* when the time is propitious),¹² he is discerning: he knows "a hawk from a handsaw," precisely as one today knows a "hog from a side-saddle."

Shakspeare is so fond of puns and involved word-play, even to the extent of double and triple punning, that the student gleans little from these realms of gold when reading only literally. With evidence now at hand that the passage involves handsaw, the earlier interpretations based on *hernshaw* obviously must be forsaken; but this does not remove the theory held by some that in Hamlet's wild words there is a so-called hidden meaning. What, then, is the meaning of the Prince?

In this connection, it will be recalled that Hamlet is discussing with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern matters relating to the players who are to perform in Elsinore. Rosencrantz explains that "an aerie [a nest of hawks] of children, little eyases" [young hawks; *i.e.*, unfledged novices] are challenging the popularity of the "common players." Now, it is possible that "handsaw," a common tool, links in some way with "common players" and also with "Your hands," Hamlet's words of greeting to the "common players"; certainly the word "hawk" might easily refer to "an aerie" and "little eyases."

However this may be, one point is clear: Hamlet is suspicious of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern; he recognizes that they are spies, because in an "aside" he says: "I have an eye of you." It accordingly seems not at all unnatural to associate Rosencrantz and Guildenstern with the well-recognized figurative meaning of hawk; namely, a person

who preys or spies upon another. But what does "handsaw" mean? One may reply by observing that as Hamlet is speaking Polonius enters and launches into one of his wordy discourses, becoming as echolalic as a handsaw. After hearing Polonius speak only three short lines, Prince Hamlet exclaims: "Buz, buz!"

Hamlet clearly sought to astonish his hearers, but Shakspeare doubtless did not desire to mystify his listeners. In stating that "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw," Hamlet would appear to imply that he was not as stupid as his auditors seemed to believe, that when their subterfuges were so baldly plain, he at least could detect a spying *hawk* from an old man as full of "buzzes" as a *handsaw*.

Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas.

¹Pages 170-71.

²"Handsaw" is of course acceptable wording "Hondsawe" occurs as early as 1411 (see *NED*), and the word appears elsewhere in Shakspeare (e.g., 1 *Hy*, IV, iv, 187).

³See the remarks by Furness

⁴In the Argentine epic, *The Gaucho Martin Fierro* (New York, 1936), a "darkey" states that he does "not know the O, because it is round" (*no conocer la O por redonda*), which translator Walter Owen renders as "I don't know J from O"

⁵The statement is usually negative according to Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (New York, 1937, p. 380).

⁶G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (New York, 1929).

⁷John C. Duval, *The Adventures of Big-Foot Wallace*, ed M. Major and R. W. Smith (Dallas, 1936), p. 290, n. 3.

⁸Haldeen Braddy, "Tall Talk of the Texas Trans-Pecos," *American Speech* (April, 1940), XV, 221

⁹There is a variant of this in obscene language

¹⁰Other similar sayings from current speech might be adduced, but the reader is doubtless familiar enough with this type of proverbial phrase.

¹¹Pages 290-91.

¹²Apparently it is an old belief that people forget courtly manners and behave according to their natural feelings when the south wind blows; see the famous novel by Norman Douglas, *South Wind*.

SHAKSPERE'S DUKES

By CURTIS B. WATSON

I.

SHAKSPERE'S Dukes, when considered as a group (excluding those in the English history plays) perform a surprisingly uniform function in the plots of the eight comedies and two tragedies in which they appear. This is of particular interest because the relationship which the Dukes bear to the structure of Shakspeare's plots is not present in any of the plays of his chief predecessors, Lyly, Greene, Peele, Nash, Lodge, Kyd and Marlowe, or in any of the more important anonymous plays from the period before Shakspeare. Nor is it present in any but a few of the Italian novelle, the sources of so many Elizabethan plays, if the tales in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, the chief Elizabethan collection in translation, can be taken as representative. Apparently it is an element of plot construction original with Shakspeare, whose usual lack of originality in the matter of plot is notorious.

What is this function? In brief, it is the presence of the Duke either at the beginning or end of a main plot of the play; his presence being in his official capacity as head of the state. When he appears in this way at the opening of a plot, he performs some act of state which brings about the conflict involving the chief characters. Thus, in the first scene of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Duke Theseus decrees that Hermia must choose between marrying the man of her father's choice, Demetrius, and taking the alternative penalties of a life of chastity as a nun or death as provided for disobedient daughters by Athenian law. This sets the main plot in motion. Lysander and Hermia flee to the woods where the ensuing action of the play takes place.

At the end of a play the rôle of the Duke is threefold: he acts to resolve the conflict in the interests of justice; he grants mercy to the offenders; and finally he plays the host at the festivities which are presumably to follow on the successful resolution of the dramatic conflict. Thus at the

end of *Measure for Measure* the Duke establishes justice in the conflict between Angelo and Isabella and then grants mercy to a presumably repentant Angelo. And the whole last act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* provides an extended example of the Duke fulfilling the rôle of host.

Two objections may occur to the reader in regard to these generalizations. How can any one find a typically Shaksperian feature of plot structure when his plots are usually dependent on a source? Again, how can one generalize about the Duke as a type when in so many cases he is an individualized character? I believe both objections may be answered. It is true that most of the plays with Dukes have plots taken from one or more sources. But in almost every case Shakspeare either modifies or adds to his source in the particular way in which he puts his Duke into his plot. And in regard to the second objection, I hope to show that even they serve this peculiarly Shaksperian function which is the only excuse dramatically for the existence of the uncharacterized Dukes.¹

An examination of the characteristics of the Duke in the rôle which I have suggested he performs shows certain qualities which the Dukes have in common. These qualities are connected with the duties they serve in their official capacities at the beginning and end of the plot. Therefore, though the Duke may be called a type character, the qualities which distinguish him, unlike those of the bragging soldier, for instance, are a direct result of his function in the plot. For the sake of convenience, however, I shall hereafter refer to the Duke as a "type Duke", meaning by this any Duke when he is serving the rôle of representative of the State or when he acts in a manner fitting in tone that of the close of a comedy—as the granting of mercy or the suggesting of a festive celebration.

One of the chief uses to which the type Duke is put is the maintenance of the laws of the state. Most frequently this occurs at the beginning and at the end of the play. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Comedy of Errors*, and *Measure for Measure* are all obvious examples. Duke Solinus and Duke Theseus both appear briefly in the first scene in order

to decree the carrying out of the inflexible laws of their states within a certain period; at the end, they reappear to enforce the law's penalty on the unfortunate victims, Aegeon and Hermia respectively, but find a change in the situation which allows them to set the law aside.² The Duke in *Measure for Measure* maintains the law in another way: by deputing his office to Angelo in order to end his own too lenient government. He then assumes the disguise of a Friar until the end of the play, when he returns in his own person to establish justice. *Measure for Measure* is indeed a particularly apt illustration of the way in which the individualized Duke still serves the function of the type Duke. When he appears in his own person at the beginning and end of the play, he is carrying out the functions of the type Duke. When he is in the disguise of a Friar, as he is through much of the play, he becomes a definitely individualized character.

The establishment of justice is a second and closely associated function which the type Duke performs. Examples of it are numerous. In *Measure for Measure*, to take a single instance, Angelo has punished Claudio (so Angelo thinks) for the very crime he himself is desiring to commit. Therefore, in accordance with the demands of justice the Duke returns to his own character to mete out retribution on Angelo, "measure for measure."

At this point in the play, a third plot function is performed by the Duke. Mariana pleads for Angelo's life and, after Isabella has also knelt and asked for mercy, the Duke grants it. This, naturally, takes place at the close of the comedy where, once justice has been done to the virtuous party, the spirit of the conventional happy ending calls for acts of forgiveness and accompanying repentance. In *Measure for Measure*, of course, the justice of the grant of mercy and the sincerity of the repentance of the offender have been the subject of much critical controversy. Regardless of the merits of this question, the play is an excellent example of the Duke's fulfilling a traditional rôle.

In *Two Gentlemen of Verona* the Duke does not play the

disinterested part that he plays elsewhere. However, when he does perceive Valentine's true worth, he pardons not only him but also the whole band of outlaws whom Valentine has been leading during his stay in the forest. This final act of justice on the Duke's part and the liberality of his forgiveness reinstate him in the audience's sympathy. When he is the stern father, forcing his daughter to marry a man of rank, he is seen in an extremely unfavorable light. When, as at the end of the play, he is largely the type Duke in the position of head of the state, he redeems himself and is given the respect fitting to his position.

The use of the Duke to maintain the laws and establish justice brings up the question of the degree of authority he possesses. Is he above the law? An investigation of this question discloses the following results. In five plays out of the ten containing Dukes, there is reference to the state's possessing laws which are, apparently, outside the Duke's sole jurisdiction. In one of these plays, *Measure for Measure*, the Duke apparently can modify the law at will; in the other four, *The Comedy of Errors*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Othello*, and *The Merchant of Venice*, he seems to be definitely subservient to the law of the state. In *The Merchant of Venice*, of course, the conflict between justice (as dictated by the laws of the state) and mercy (as established by the Christian tradition) is a large part of the main plot. Shylock defies the Duke to disregard the law. "If you deny me, fie upon your law!" And the Duke is indeed ready to "dismiss the court" when Portia arrives upon the scene. The question whether the Duke, entirely in sympathy with Antonio, will set himself above the law is an intense one until she takes command of the situation, assures Shylock and all concerned that the law must be obeyed, and then turns this weapon of strict legality upon Shylock.³

The question whether the Duke is above the law or not seems to be essentially a matter of dramatic expediency. This view is supported by noting the way in which the Dukes disregard the strict letter of the law in *The Comedy of Errors* and *A midsummer Night's Dream*. In spite of the fact that each of the Dukes has stated that he must ob-

serve the law, it is set aside in both the pardon of Aegeon and the acceptance of the new state of affairs in the romantic complications of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. No one protests at this trivial deviation from technical consistency. The laws of Shakspeare's comedy world need be strictly enforced only so long as the dramatist desires a barrier in the way of heroes and heroines.

Because of his position as head of the state, the Duke is a character of great dignity. This is especially true of the type Duke who is usually functioning in his official capacity. It is less true of the individualized Duke. This is shown by the esteem in which the other characters hold the type Duke: he is always addressed as "your Grace", "most gracious lord", "noble Duke", etc.; he is never addressed with the familiar *thee*;⁴ he is almost always accompanied by an escort; and he usually ends at least the formal part of the play.

This dignity also comes out in the politeness and lack of strong emotion on the part of the Duke. In several instances mention is made of the fighting ability of the Duke but this is always in reference to his past, enhancing his reputation and yet leaving an impression of gravity. The impression is often given of much learning and wisdom, as Prospero so strongly exemplifies. In short, the Duke usually leaves the impression of a sort of elderly Renaissance gentleman.

That this dignity, again, is merely owing to the requirements of the plot is shown in the breaking down of the formal barrier between the Duke and the other characters at the end of the comedies. The Duke suggests festivities, as in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where Duke Theseus speaks of a coming fortnight of "nightly revels and new jollity" after a fifth act in which he has been a genial commentator on the "tedious brief scene of young Pyramus and his love Thisby." There is even a suggestion of the Duke's playing host at the end of Act Four of *The Merchant of Venice*, where one would least expect it. The Duke invites Portia to dinner, but she declines for obvious reasons. In

both these cases, as in others like them, the Dukes become extraordinarily informal in comparison with their previous behaviour. This is, of course, necessary in order to leave the audience with a feeling of cordiality and joviality, which is the predominant tone at the end of the play. Often, as in *As You Like It*, an opportunity is provided to clear the stage by the Duke's proposal of a celebration of some sort. This, in turn, allows the Duke to suggest that any minor confusions which are still unresolved will be cleared up in the gossiping, at the feast, over the wondrous events which have just taken place. A feeling of completeness is thus given to the action without boring the audience with details and losing the merry mood of the play's close.

The fact that the Duke is engaged in a rôle dominated by plot considerations and without character interest is brought out by the following table of figures as to the number of scenes in which he appears.

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>The Comedy of Errors</i> | 2 scenes, including first and last |
| <i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> | 5 scenes, including * and last |
| <i>Midsummer Night's Dream</i> | 3 scenes, including first and last |
| <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> | 1 scene * |
| <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> | 3 scenes, including first and last |
| <i>As You Like It</i> | 3 scenes, including * and last |
| <i>Twelfth Night</i> | 4 scenes, including first and last |
| <i>Measure for Measure</i> | ** including first and last |
| <i>Othello</i> | 1 scene * * |
| <i>The Tempest</i> | * last |

After what I have said about the Duke's function, it is not surprising to find that he is present in so few scenes, and that such a large proportion of them are at the beginning and end of the play. It is surprising, on the other hand, that the scenes in which the individualized Dukes are not serving the rôle of type character are few. The Duke in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* appears only in four individualized scenes; Duke Senior is present in only two scenes other than that in which he chiefly fulfils the rôle of type Duke; Duke Orsino is on in only two scenes other than the

*Indicates that the Duke appears in what is the beginning or end of a plot though not at the beginning or end of the play itself

**Indicates that the number of scenes is too great to have significance. In *Measure for Measure*, however, the Duke appears undisguised in only three scenes, two of which are the first and the last.

first and the last—although in these he is mainly an individualized Duke. In only two plays, *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest*, are the Dukes present in more than a small proportion of the total number of scenes.

Another numerical proportion of some significance is that between the length of time the Dukes are on the stage and the length of time they are speaking. Often, as in the beginning of *The Comedy of Errors*, the Duke does most of the listening and the other characters most of the speaking. In the court scene in *The Merchant of Venice*, after Portia has arrived, more than two hundred lines are spoken while the Duke remains silent. Even a very individualized Duke, Orsino in *Twelfth Night*, has little to say at the end of the play.

The reason for the infrequency of the Duke's presence and the sparsity of the lines he speaks is obvious. He is not an interesting character dramatically, as is shown by his dignity and lack of emotion. Perhaps of more importance is the fact that the Duke's presence in any scenes imposes a restraint on other characters. In view of his rank, respect must be shown him while he is on the stage, and this precludes the development of the action or the presentation of low or high comedy. Only when the Duke is serving such a rôle as that of the match-making parent, as in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or *The Tempest*, can he be brought frequently into scenes where the plot is being developed. And the fact that only once does the Duke appear in low comedy scenes, and then in disguise, shows what a damper his presence is on scenes of low comedy. This single instance is the insulting of the Duke of Lucio in *Measure for Measure*. Shakspeare makes the most of his possibilities for comedy in having Lucio unwittingly calumniate the Duke's character and reputation to his face.

The fact that the Duke is present in the first and last scenes gives him two functions which are largely accidental. When he appears in the opening scene he naturally gives some of the needed exposition, though he is there primarily for other reasons. Again, the fact that the Duke takes part in the final scene and, as the person of highest rank, speaks the conclud-

ing lines, means that he often serves the purpose of summing up the action, as at the end of *Romeo and Juliet*.⁵

A comparison of the Dukes in the plays with their prototypes in the 'sources' is significant. Of the nine plays discussed, three had a definite prototype for Shakspeare's ruling figure, a prototype with the same title in both the play and its source. Hence, two of these, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Twelfth Night*, are of little importance in ascertaining Shakspeare's handling of the Duke. However, the construction of the plot of the third play, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, is Shakspeare's, and therefore the fact that its Duke, Theseus, performs many of the functions of the type Duke is significant.

Six of the nine plays have no Duke in the source. Two of these, *As You Like It* and *Measure for Measure*, have a king in the source who corresponds to Shakspeare's Duke; but Shakspeare's conception of these two somewhat individualized characters and his locating of them in the plot are largely his own. The Duke in *As You Like It* has little chance to play the rôle of the type Duke inasmuch as he is in exile throughout the play. The Duke in *Measure for Measure* is closer to the source in regard to his functions as a type character; but his presence in the opening scene is original with Shakspeare.

The four remaining plays have no prototypes whatsoever for the Duke. *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* are two of this group, and they are significantly two of Shakspeare's earliest plays, suggesting that this type Duke was used by him from the beginning of his career as a dramatist—when it was suitable to the material of the sources with which he was working. *The Comedy of Errors* contains perhaps the most perfect example of the use of the Duke purely for his type functions. Although *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* has no known source for the part of its Duke, his originality with Shakspeare must be minimized, as his character is chiefly individualized.

The Dukes in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* are almost definitely original with Shakspeare because the sug-

gestions for their creation exist in only a few lines of their respective sources. They are both type Dukes in their brief appearance in the plays.

There are, then, four plays whose Duke performs almost exclusively typical functions and is at the same time practically original with Shakspeare—*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Othello*. There are two plays in which the Duke's rôle as a type character largely follows the source—*Measure for Measure* and *Romeo and Juliet*. There are two plays in which the Duke has only a limited type part—*As You Like It* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In *As You Like It* the Duke's part in the main follows the source; in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* it is probably original. Finally, in *Twelfth Night* the Duke's rôle is largely indebted to the source and is also only to a small degree that of a type Duke.

Cambridge, Mass.

¹Duke Orsino in *Twelfth Night* and more especially Prospero in *The Tempest* are too individualized to perform many functions similar to those of the type Duke. But even here there are points of comparison—such as the way in which Prospero and Orsino conclude the plays. The villainous Dukes in *As You Like It* and *The Tempest* are left out of the discussion for obvious reasons.

²The end of the main plot of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* occurs at the end of Act Four. So likewise does the Antonio-Shylock plot of *The Merchant of Venice*. The plots of *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *As You Like It*, on the other hand, begin in a sense with the Second Act, in which the respective Dukes first appear; in both cases the locale of the play is established at this point.

³Mention should be made of the peculiar position of the two Dukes of Venice in *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice*. In both plays there is a recognition of a political power other than that of the Duke: the Senators in *Othello* and the Magnificoes in *The Merchant of Venice*. Brabantio is referred to as one "whose voice is double as the Duke's", a clear suggestion of this division of political power.

⁴Proteus uses *thee* to the Duke in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*; but at that moment he is in a personal relation to the Duke, whom he is advising in family affairs.

⁵Of course, the ruling figure in *Romeo and Juliet* is a Prince. He is included in this paper, however, because he is a type Duke in all but name.

A CONTEMPORARY ATTACK UPON SHAKSPERE?

By ALFRED HARBAGE

THE *Tragical History, Admirable Achievements, and various events of Guy Earl of Warwick, A Tragedy Acted very Frequently with great Applause, By his late Majesties Servants. Written by B. J.* Thus reads a title page of 1661. The "B. J." probably means only that the publishers, Thomas Vere and William Gilbertson, having a play to vend, wished to suggest the name which in 1661 and for a few years thereafter stood highest on the roster of English playwrights. The only connection between this play and the Restoration period may be the misleading title-page: some copies, although none I have seen, contain a flyleaf marked "Imprimatur. April. 6. 1639."¹ That the tragedy was "Acted very Frequently . . . By his late Majesties Servants" must also have been invented for a title-page refurbishing an old book. It is extremely unlikely that any play of the type of *Guy of Warwick* was ever acted by the modish King's Company in the time of Charles or even in the time of James.

In his *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, Halliwell-Phillipps suggested that the play might be identical with *The Life and Death of Guy of Warwick*, entered in the Stationers' Register January 15, 1620, as by Day and Dekker—to which A. H. Bullen rejoined ". . . I doubt whether either of the authors, if they had tried, could have written so execrably."² Bullen's remark seems to have killed further interest in the play among historians of the drama. The piece, however, is not contemptible. The curious impression it makes is due to the fact that *Guy of Warwick* is completely archaic for 1661, for 1639, or even for 1620. Either it was already old in 1620 or its author must be imagined as a sort of seventeenth-century Chatterton. The lines,

His sacred fury menaceth that Nation,
Which hath Indea under Sequestration:
He doth not strike at Surplices and Tippets
(To bring an Oleo in of Sects in Sippits),

included in Time's speech before the second act, strike the only seventeenth-century note, and even in their style suggest an insertion into earlier work.

The *Guy of Warwick* of 1661 (1639) was written, I believe, in approximately its present form about the year 1593. There is no record of a *Guy of Warwick* play at that time, but we can postulate the existence of one. Henslowe records performances of a *Huon of Bordeaux* in 1593 and of a *Godfrey of Boulogne, Part II*, in 1594.³ It is incredible that the English worthy was banished while these foreign knights, with whom his name was often associated, were striding the boards: patriotism would forbid! Of the three literary sources of our play, the latest in print⁴ was *A plesante songe of the valiant actes of Guy of Warwick*, a ballad published in 1592. The fact is noteworthy because the *Guy of Warwick* legend gathered accretions as time passed, and the play shows no effect of the accretions after 1592. For instance, it is next to certain that any play on the subject written after 1608 would have made use of Samuel Rowlands' narrative poem *The Famous History of Guy Earl of Warwicke*, which succeeded to the popularity once enjoyed by the metrical romance.

The best indication of an early date is the text of the play itself. It is constructed like the older chronicles, with each act presenting a new exploit of the English hero and new drolleries by the hero's clownish servant. The following passage from Act V indicates the general quaintness:

Phillis. Give me some Bread? I prethee Father Eat.
Guy. Give me Brown Bread, for thats a Pilgrimes Meat.
Phillis. Reach me some Wine, good Father tast of this.
Guy. Give me cold Water that my Comfort is, . . .

In its kind the handling of the material is effective, and the venerable *Guy's* conquest of the Danish champion in the fourth act would have quickened the pulse of any London audience in the sixteenth century, and of any country audience long thereafter. Throughout the play, Time acts as Chorus and Presenter, narrating those deeds of Sir *Guy* not represented in action, in a manner reminding us of Marlowe's *Faustus* and other plays of its vintage:

Renowned Sir Guy of Warwick whose great Name,
 makes England famous in all after times,
 for nursing up so brave a Martiallist,
 Time now renues his fortunes to the world
 and layes them open to your Gentle Views;
 think then with apprehensive eyes you see
 this warlike Lord boldly attempt to fight,
 with that fell savage Bore of Caledon
 that spoiles the fields and murders passengers,
 him hath his sword subdu'd;

. Imagine then,
 King Athelstone hath left fair Winchester
 and here in Warwick Castle keeps his Court.
 What follows now of Guy and his fair Deeds,
 sit and behold, the story now proceeds.⁵

Compare with Chorus's speech before Act II of Dekker's
Old Fortunatus:

Suppose you see him [Fortunatus] brought to Babylon;
 And that the sun clothed all in fire hath rid
 One quarter of his hot celestial way
 With the bright morning, and that in this instant,
 He and the Soldan meet, but what they say
 Listen you—the talk of kings none dare bewray.

Even by 1599 Dekker felt somewhat apologetic about employing the Chorus in this old-fashioned way: in his Prologue the Muse

. . . begs your pardon, for she'll send me forth
 Not when the laws of poesy do call
 But as the story needs . . .

I quote the passages only as an indication of an early date of the play, not as evidence of Dekker's authorship. Dekker as author, however, cannot be summarily dismissed.

H. Dugdale Sykes, who has listed parallel passages as proof of authorship more convincingly than anyone else, has noted Dekker's fondness for iteration.⁶ Observe in the present play "O Master! the Devil, the Devil, the Devil" (Act II); "Tarry, tarry, tarry, hold, hold, hold" (Act III); "O my belly, my belly, my belly" (Act V). Sykes has noted that "'Hellhound' is one of his most frequently used, and most distinctive, terms of abuse."⁷ Observe in the present play "Hell-hound come forth, that I may cope with thee" (Act II). Just as Fortune awakens Fortunatus with music

in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, so Oberon, as benign spirit, awakens Sir Guy in the present piece:

Nymphes, Satyres, Fawnes, and all the Fairy train,
that waits on Oberon the Fairy King,
attend me quickly with your silver tunes;
and in a circled Ring, lets compasse round,
this sleeping Knight that lies upon the ground.

(Enter the Fairies with Musick . . .)

Guy. Where art thou Guy? what heavenly place is this?
what ravishing sound of Music fills mine ear?"⁸

For Thomas Dekker music was ever *ravishing*. The phrase "silver tunes" is interesting in view of the following, from Dekker:

Music talk louder, that thy silver voice
May reach my sovereign's ears.

Satiromastix, II. 1.

I tried and found it true: and secretly
Commanded music with her silver tongue
To chime soft lullabies . . .

Old Fortunatus, III, 2.

I offer one more parallel, by far the most striking: Dekker's

Canst drink the waters of the crisped spring?
O sweet content.⁹

perfects a distich in *Guy of Warwick*, Act V:

. your great Lord and I,
have thought our selves as happy as a King,
To drink the water of a Christal spring.

That such evidence amounts to proof I do not pretend, nor that *Guy of Warwick* is *worthy* of the playwright whom we have come to admire. It is too naive, the blank verse often too mechanical or languid. But we must remember that Dekker's early work is lost, and we do not know how he may have been writing in 1593. This¹⁰ may be his first play, written just as he reached his majority. The author is mentioned in Time's concluding speech—worth quoting also for several fine slow lines, and for the benedictory note typical only of pre-seventeenth-century plays:

Thus Time concludes this dolent History,
And ends this Scene with Guy of Warwick's death;
So what is it but Time can bring to passe?

Time layes up Treasure where ther's Vertue scant,
 And gives the silly Fool when wise Men want:
 Both Poor and Rich confesse my power Divine,
 And every one doth say, make much of Time,
 Through the whole World, while the world was, Time rangeth,
 And 'tis mens manners, and not Time that changeth.
 Of you whose Souls look for Eternity,
 Rest in the peace of perpetuity,
 And kindly grant to this request of mine;
 For he's but young that writes of this Old Time.
 Therefore if this your Eyes or Ears may please,
 He means to shew you better things than these.

I shall request for a moment a "suspension of disbelief" while I fill in, with suppositions, the contours connecting the peaks of fact that rise out of the mist. About 1593 young Dekker, destined later to do "better things," wrote *Guy of Warwick*, which, after a brief career in London, went on the road as part of the repertory of II Derby's Men in 1594. During the long provincial career¹¹ of this company, the play remained a stock piece. On October 14, 1618, John Taylor, the water poet, was stopping at the Maidenhead Inn, Islington, where "we had a play of the Life and Death of Guy of Warwick, played by the Right Honourable the Earl of Derby his men."¹² In the meantime, Dekker had become an old hand as a dramatist in London, and was writing new plays on some of the themes he had treated in his youth. In 1620 he collaborated with Massinger on *The Virgin Martyr*, a new version of *Diocletian*, which he had written originally in 1594.¹³ A short time earlier he had collaborated with John Day on a new version of *Guy of Warwick*. On January 20, 1620, the play was entered in the Stationers' Register by John Trundle, who on December 13 of the same year assigned his rights to Thomas Langley.¹⁴ Unfortunately, however, the play was never printed, and the title in the Stationers' Register was naturally identified in later ages as the play seen by Taylor at Islington. But the old play went on its independent way. In 1633 it was still being acted before country audiences by a group of tattered strollers, and Dobson had seen it before Thomas Nabbes brought him to London to be a character in *Covent Garden*:

Ralph. . . . we shall then be neere the Cockpit, and see a play now and then.

Dobs. But tell me Ralph, are those players the ragged fellows that were at our house last Christmas, that borrowed the red blanket off my bed to make their Major a gowne; and had the great Pot-lid for Guy of Warwicks Buckler?

Ralph. No, Dobson, they are men of Credit.¹⁵

Finally, the old text, somewhat debased by years of copying by actors none too careful of their grammar, found its way into print, and survived, with a title page faked in 1661, as an enigma for posterity. The light is imperfect, and the things one sees may not be precisely what occurred.

And now I should like to dismiss all theories except that *Guy of Warwick* is old—as old as 1593. This I firmly believe to be true. If the play of 1661 had been published in 1593, and later submitted to the scrutiny which all plays of that time have received, how would the following passage from Act V have been interpreted?

Rainborne. . . . prethee where wer't born?

Sparrow. Ifaith Sir I was born in England at Stratford upon Aven in Warwickshire.

Rainborne. Wer't born in England? What's thy name?

Sparrow. Nay I have a fine finical name, I can tell ye, for my name is Sparrow; yet I am no house Sparrow, nor no hedge Sparrow, nor no peaking Sparrow, nor no sneaking Sparrow, but I am a high mounting lofty minded Sparrow, and that Parnell knows well enough, and a good many more of the pretty Wenches of our Parish ifaith.

Sir Guy came from Warwickshire and might naturally be squired by someone from his native county, but why should the town be specified? and why should that town be Stratford-upon-Avon? And why should this clown, this "bird of Venus, and a Cock of the game,"¹⁶ this sneak thief of the "Pogans snap-sacks,"¹⁷ describe himself at this moment as a *high mounting lofty minded Sparrow*? Then that *fine finical name*. Sparrow is not a fine finical name, but come to think of it, *Shakspere* is—an offense in itself to rival poets so plainly dubbed as Robert Green or Tom Dekker.

Sparrow is never referred to as a poet. If he were, we would be confronted by a minor miracle, because the allusion to Shakspere would be undebatable. Sparrow, in most

ways the conventional clown, is wholly base and contemptible. It is unpleasant to consider him a lampoon upon Shakspeare, and even more unpleasant to think of our genial Thomas Dekker as author of the lampoon. I shall merely repeat that if *Guy of Warwick* had been published in 1593, Sparrow would long since have been identified as the dramatist, and embattled commentators would contest the issue of whether Sir Guy adumbrated Southampton. Truly, Shakspeare's early career in London may well have provoked more than the one known public slur by Greene. Some rival company may have attacked him on the stage. Success in its beginnings rarely goes uncastigated. Shakspeare was an intruder upon Parnassus, irritatingly superior: we do not know what spurns his patient merit took of the unworthy, of the resentful, of the young and foolish.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹R. S. Crane, "The Vogue of Guy of Warwick," PMLA, XXX (1915) 162n

²*Works of John Day*, 1881, p. 11.

³*Henslowe's Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg, Part 1, 1904, pp. 16, 18. The "2 pte of godfrey of bullen" is specified as new.

⁴The others are the Huon of Bordeaux legend, from which one episode was borrowed, and the old metrical romance of Guy of Warwick, which had been in print in a number of editions since the late fifteenth century. Many details in the play could have come only from the metrical romance. See R. S. Crane, *op cit.*, pp. 164-165.

⁵Time's speech before Act I.

⁶*Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama*, p. 106.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁸Act II.

⁹I believe that Dekker's claim to this lyric is still good.

¹⁰Various passages in *Guy of Warwick* remind me of Dekker's cast of thought those that have learned of Angells how to sing,
and to the world all piety doth bring,
and fills the world with learning and with Art,
to those doth Time her Golden gifts impart,

Time's Induction to Act III.

The longest Summers day comes to an end,
the dials point though none perceive it stir (Act V.)

long stories are not told in little time,
much matter in small room we must combyne;
wee'l curtall nothing, yet make something short,
because we would shun tediousnesse of sport;
if it be long, say length is all the fault,
if it be lame, say old men needs must halt.

Time's Induction to Act III.

The unexpected whimsicality of the concluding line above is typical of Dekker. compare with the concluding line of Chorus's speech from *Old Fortunatus*, quoted above, with which speech compare also the following:

Now that the poasting Charet of the Sonne,
hath tired Phoebus and his wanton steeds,
the duskey Clouds hath closed up the day,
and Hesperus is left to guide the world.

Act V. (*Guy of Warwick*).

¹¹J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642*, 1910, II, 295-296.

¹²John Taylor, *Penniless Pilgrimage*, 1618, ed. C. Hindley, *Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, Vol II, No. 10, p. 67.

¹³That *The Virgin Martyr* is a rewriting of the lost *Diocletian*, and that the latter was by Dekker, was proposed by Fleay, and the proposal has met with considerable favor. (See W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 172). Similar claims, concerning rewriting, have been made for a number of plays, Dekker's and those of other dramatists, and while the evidence in individual instances must be inconclusive, the general proposition, that certain "lost" plays of the 'nineties survive in later adaptations, must be accepted as probable.

¹⁴Here the record in the Stationers' Register ceases. I wish to pose a problem for scientific bibliographers. Who, on the basis of typographical evidence, was the original publisher of the play bearing Vere and Gilbertson's title page in 1661? If it was Langley, Dekker's claim to the play is established, but my general theory about *Guy of Warwick* receives a blow.

¹⁵Thomas Nabbes, *Covent Garden*, I, 1.

¹⁶He so describes himself in Act II, telling Sir Guy "My mistress Parnell is as precious to me, as your Lady Phillis is to you." (He has got Parnell with child before leaving Stratford-on-Avon.) Parnell was the stock name for a loose woman, Sparrow probably for a lecher, hence "bird of Venus." Still, *Venus and Adonis* was published in 1593.

¹⁷Act III.

AN EARLY *HAMLET* ALLUSION

By HOWARD SCHULTZ

THE next revisers of the *Shakespeare Allusion-Book* may wish to include, for the year 1633, an all but anonymous quotation of *Hamlet*, I, v, 53-57. The lines are printed as prose and without credit in supplementary matter padding out the third edition of the *Philosophers' Banquet*, an expansion of that popular household manual of health hints, venerable satire, and jests, attributed by some to Theobaldus Anguilbertus, but by most to the thirteenth-century "wizard," Michael Scott.¹ Of the second English translation, which title-pages credit to an otherwise unknown "W. B. Esquire," there were progressively enlarged editions in 1609, 1614, and 1633; but only the last of these offers a final 130 pages, unknown to the Latin texts, captioned "A Divine and Philosophicall conference betweene some Fathers of the Church, and some Philosophers of Nature, proposing . . . Pious . . . Aenigmaes."² To the question, "May it be that stollen pleasures should be thought more sweet than an honest fruition in lawfull marriage?" the author of this "table conference," whom for lack of better information we may identify with "W. B.," gives the following answer:

We desire forbidden things, and that is the perversenesse of our flesh, that will not be brided with no lawfull bounds, and wee see by experience that many men that have beautiful wives neglect their own better, and pray upon others more deformed. For Vertue as it never will bee mou'd, though lewdness court it in the shape of heaven; So Lust, though to a radiant Angell linckt, will sort it selfe in a terrestrial bed, and prey on garbige.³

The misquotation of the First Folio text is worth a moment's consideration. As printed in 1623 the familiar lines of the Ghost's speech run:

Though Lewdnesse court it in a shape of Heauen
So Lust, though to a radiant Angell link'd,
Will sate it selfe in a Celestiall bed, & prey on Garbage.

Taken by itself, the last line looks like a correction of an obvious misprint in the "surreptitious" First Quarto of 1603:

Would fate it selfe from a celestiaall bedde,
And prey on garbage.

The "good" quartos of 1604 and 1611 are closer to the prose of "W. B.":

Will sort it selfe in a celestiaall bed
And pray on garbage.

It was the opinion of Tschischwitz, quoted by H. H. Furness,⁴ that *sort* of the good quartos is perfectly allowable:

The reading of the Qq makes excellent sense, even without changing 'in' to *from*. 'Even in a celestial bed lust will separate, detach itself, etc.' Not only 'link'd,' but also 'prey,' shows *sort* to be the emphatic word. It is small wonder if German commentators prefer 'sate' to *sort*, but Englishmen, before whose vision the enormous breadth of their own almost square beds must have instantly arisen, ought to have conceived the right idea of *separation in bed*. Moreover, 'sate itself' cannot be connected with 'prey on garbage' on physiological grounds.

Whether the language of "W. B." is an arbitrary correction of a quarto print or a stage recollection with a shadow of textual authority in its own right, it confirms Tschischwitz's definition of *sort*. Yet even with this definition the German editor's ingenious interpretation makes but strained sense out of the quarto reading; the notion of separation in bed seems somehow far-fetched and trivial. If Shakspeare wrote "sort . . . celestial," as he probably did not, he left an improvable line. The Folio reading, "sate . . . celestial," is a feasible alteration; the "W. B." version, "sort . . . terrestrial," is another.

Northwestern University
Evanston, Ill.

¹An informal description of the work is to be found in "The Philosophy of the Table under Charles I," *Retrospective Review* II (1854), 142-150. Thomas F. Dunn, "The Facetiae of the *Mensa Philosophorum*," *Washington University Studies in Language and Literature*, N. S., No. 5 (June, 1934), pp. 9-13, gives a convenient bibliography of the manuscripts and prints.

²This caudal display of theological and moral banalities contains another echo of Shakspeare, listed in George Thorn-Drury's collection, *Some Seventeenth Century Allusions to Shakespeare and His Works* (London, 1920), p. 1. The lines quoted are nearly identical with *Richard II*, III, iii, 169-170.

³Pp. 326-327.

⁴Ed. *Hamlet*, in *The Variorum Shakespeare*, I (1877), 101 n.

SPENSER'S FABLE OF "THE OAKE AND THE BRERE"

By LOUIS S. FRIEDLAND

IN an interesting paper (*SAB*, XV, 103-109), Mr. Sidney Rosenzweig advances the following suggestions regarding the fable in Spenser's February Eclogue: (1) that the fable is closely related to and actually developed from a passage in Ascham's *Scholemaster*; (2) that a contemporary allusion to the downfall or ill-treatment of some Roman-Catholic notable—whom Mr. Rosenzweig is unable to identify—is shrouded in the well-known lines:

"For it had bene an auncient tree,
Sacred with many a mysteree,
And often crost with the priestes crewe,
And often halowed with holy water dewe.
But sike fancies weren foolerie,
And broughten this Oake to this miserye." (207-12)

The evidence adduced by Mr. Rosenzweig to support his views will bear examination.

Beyond a doubt, Spenser (and E. K., very likely) were acquainted with Ascham's book; therefore, it may be assumed, with the passage therein upon which Mr. Rosenzweig bases his first contention. To demonstrate the kinship between Spenser's fable and Ascham's sustained metaphor: Cambridge scholarship as "mightie great timber" or trees shot up from "the yong spring," Mr. Rosenzweig resorts to the method of citing parallel passages in which verbal identities are conveniently italicized for the reader. I had thought that this mode of 'proving' literary origins had long ago been renounced by scholars for the very reasons that make Mr. Rosenzweig's parallelisms far-fetched, fanciful, and inconclusive. The listing of similarities of phrasing and diction may serve to clinch an argument already pretty well established on other and firmer grounds: external evidence of relationship, the barring of other possible sources after judicious examination of their claims, close resemblances in literary form and intention, and so on.

True, Mr. Rosenzweig opens his discussion with a reference to another possible source of Spenser's fable: the homily preached by Bishop John Young of Rochester, to which Dr. Percy W. Long first called attention some years ago.¹ The merits of this case Mr. Rosenzweig dismisses with the words: "This proposed source reveals no verbal parallel to the Eclogue beyond the mention of the briar." And yet, despite the absence of any verbal similarities between the passage in the sermon and Spenser's fable, the former may well have prompted the poet's thoughts, though in his paper Dr. Long wisely cautions us against arriving at a conviction of positive relationship between the two. The "germ" of Spenser's fable still remains Aesop's apologue of the Tree and the Briar, which Spenser, like other schoolboys of his youth, had learned by heart as a set task, and with several recensions of which he was assuredly familiar.

How, then, are we to regard the passage in Ascham's book—or that in Bishop Young's homily? Simply as an outgrowth from the same 'germ': the Aesopic fable of a Tree and a Reed, Briar, or Rosebush. Merely as applications of Aesop's idea, among many hundreds of similar ones, antedating Spenser's fable, found in pulpit-oratory, emblem-writings, letters,—in every variety of prose and poetic literature. In fact, the metaphoric use of the Aesopic apologue had become pretty well standardized, so that scores of passages of a purport similar to Ascham's passage might be gathered in contemporary literature, if the effort were worth it. Some of them are alluded to in my study of Spenser's fables.² A stock metaphor, it occurs everywhere; nothing was more common for figurative purposes than the convenient, homely, and familiar 'lesson' of the Oak and the Briar. Witness, among others, the lines in Spenser's *Ruines of Time* (450-455) and in the *Tears of the Muses* (75-78),—identical with Ascham's use of the well-worn, constantly iterated figure: the ancient trees of learning compared with the younger blooms. Parallels? They are a dime a dozen, so plentiful as to be dear at any price.

It is difficult to believe in 'imitation' when we are concerned with a device of expression so prevalent and wide-

spread in Elizabethan literature. But verbal echoes, it may be argued, are not to be lightly dismissed. I could wish that Mr. Rosenzweig had a better, more convincing array of verbal similarities; those he offers are too fanciful to carry weight with the scholar skeptical of this type of evidence. The establishing of the fact of Spenser's indebtedness to Ascham is in itself an attractive idea and worthy of pursuit. I must regretfully confess my opinion that the matter is not substantiated in the paper under discussion. The pitfalls of wire-drawn verbal 'analogies' are illustrated in the following passage from Mr. Rosenzweig's article (p. 107): "There may be another echo of Ascham in the pastoral scene that takes place about the Briar:

'And thereto aye wonned to repayre
The shepheards daughters, to gather flowres. (ll. 118-19).'

"E. K.'s gloss on 'wonned' reads 'to *haunt* or frequent'; Ascham's typically Elizabethan harangue against the Catholics carries the same tone of moral self-righteousness: 'honest pastimes joyned with labor left of in the fieldes: unthrifty and idle games *haunted* corners and occupied the nightes. (p. 165)." It will be seen that, when Spenser's verses fail the critic, he turns to E. K.'s glosses.

Unfortunately, E. K.'s gloss on the word 'wonned' happens to be the very one that casts the gravest doubts upon the theory that E. K. was really Spenser in disguise. Who, in the year 1578, knew so well as Chaucerian Spenser that 'wonned' here means 'were wont, were accustomed,' and not 'to haunt or frequent'? Never would Spenser have furnished or authorized this erroneous and misleading gloss. And while it seems likely that E. K. derived much of his information direct from Spenser, it is equally obvious that the poet was neither questioned about the word 'wonned' nor had oversight of this as of several others of E. K.'s annotations. On occasion E. K. was led astray by Spenser's archaic diction, which in this instance has also tripped a modern commentator.

The trouble, however, does not lie so much in the commission of errors as in the method employed: straining for verbal parallels as a means of tracing and uncovering

'sources'. A sustained plant-metaphor like the one developed by Ascham in the *Scholemaster* may profitably be compared with others of the same variety, *e.g.*, the lines in the *Ruines of Time* and in the *Teares of the Muses* already mentioned. To institute collations between these and any fable of the Oak and the Briar is to compare things quite unlike. The effective and illuminating approach to the study of the Elizabethan fable is to view it as an art-form, a minor literary genre whose rules were fixed, rigidly set in the rhetoric books of the day. A succession of rhetoricians (Leonard Cox, Thomas Wilson, Richard Rainolde, and others), studied by generations of schoolboys and university men, had examined the art of fable-writing and had established its divisions and laws and modes of amplification as precisely as the American rhetoricians of my college-days prescribed every step in the planning and writing of an argumentative brief and the developed argument. As is true of the other minor literary types—and the major ones, to a different degree—the Renaissance conceived of the fable as, first of all, a school-task in rhetoric; its structure: opening, gradations, amplifications, ornaments, closing, were definitely blue-printed for the unpracticed hand. No professor of pulpit-oratory in modern times has been more insistent on the routine of divisions, parts, and adherence to the rhetorical rules of treatment: the text, expatiation on the text, firstly, secondly, thirdly, and so on through the hortatory peroration. The modest structure of the fable had its hard and fixed architectonics.

This aspect of Spenser's fable of the "Oake and the Brere" had been briefly examined by Professor Herbert D. Dix in a review of *Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry*,³ with especial reference to Rainolde's *Foundation of Rhetorike* (1563). As Mr. Dix points out (pp. 9, 80-81), Rainolde held that the 'Oracion' made upon a fable should have eight parts, among them: reciting the fable; praise of the author (Spenser says the author is Tityrus, but E. K. correctly refers to Aesop); stating the nature of the 'thynges contained in the Fable' (the detailed description of the Oak and the Briar); setting forth 'the thynges, reasonyng one with an other' (the Briar puts his case to the Oak and then to the Husbandman);

the interpretation or explaining the moral ("Such was th'end of this ambitious Brere For scorning Eld").

In his time no one more than Spenser was so constant in adherence to the principle of literary *decorum*. For this reason, as the present writer has repeatedly stated elsewhere, the type-study of Spenser's poems brings the surest results, even in the procedure of examining analogous works and of hunting for possible sources. Spenser's first published work, *The Shepheardes Calender*, is replete with stock rhetorical devices and figures, ranging from the simple ballad simile to the set modes of constructing an eclogue, a panegyric, a flyting, an anacreontic, an elegy, and so on. At every point the *Calender* reveals its indebtedness to the school rhetoric of the time, just as surely as Shakspeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* and his early pastoral plays and comedies are chockful of the conventional conceits and devices of poetry in contemporary masque, pastoral, and drama.

This conception of Spenser's fable of 'The Oake and the Brere' enables us to view in its proper light the second of Mr. Rosenzweig's theses: that the lines in the fable describing the ancient tree cloak a reference to some personage, a Catholic, apparently. I have discussed this problem at some length in my study of *Spenser as a Fabulist*, and I see no reason for altering the opinions therein expressed. Spenser's 'oracion' on the fable of the Oak and the Briar is couched in the form of an extended parable, "an icon or hypotiposis", to use E. K.'s terms, of Youth versus Age. For this turn of the 'oracion' Spenser had no model known to us, so that it must be regarded as his own invention, a fresh version of the age-old fable. Its declared meaning is determined by Spenser's shaping thought: the bitter enmity of Youth towards Age. The ancient Oak is described as, in former times, a Gospel Oak, an object of worship. All this is a proper part of Spenser's 'oracion,' the rhetorical treatment of his theme, an ornamental bit of characterization and not a hidden allusion to a contemporary religious quarrel. As a pronounced anti-Catholic, E. K. has an especially eager nose for religio-controversial touches in the *Calender*; he never hesitates to point them out, to exaggerate their import, and to

gloat over them. But his gloss on the passage in question gives no indication of his awareness that the lines cloaked a reference to a Catholic personage. It seems to me that there is no warrant for selecting this brief passage as the 'key' to the fable, thus making the interpretation of the Oak and of the entire apologue dependent upon a highly speculative unsupported, and dubious explanation of the five lines.

It remains true, I believe, that Spenser's amplification of the fable of the Oak and the Briar has no known model in English or foreign literature and is a fresh invention; that it is an emblem, an 'icon or hypotiposis' of Youth *contra* Age, not an allegorical presentation of certain contemporary happenings; that the characters in the fable, including the Oak, do not represent historical persons: Queen Elizabeth, Lord Burghley, Bishop Watson, etc., and that the attempts at such 'recognitions' have so far been wholly unconvincing; finally, that the passage depicting the reverence once accorded the ancient Oak is an ornamental bit of rhetorical poetry, in keeping with Spenser's plan of the 'oracion' and is to be interpreted as an allusion to tree-worship and not to some Catholic personage or some religious controversy of the time.

New York City.

¹*PMLA*, XXXI (1916), 727 28.

²*SAB*, XII, April, July, October, 1937.

³*The Pennsylvania State College Studies*, No. 7, 1940.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

WILLIAM BAILEY KEMPLING

We dedicate, in sadness, this issue of our *Bulletin* to the memory of William Bailey Kempling who departed this life on January 31st, 1941, in the home-town of William Shakspeare where he had resided for the past three years. In him our Association has lost a good and loyal friend and Shakspeare an understanding and loving disciple. For many years he and the present writer had been warm and affectionate correspondence-friends; we had never met but we felt that we knew and trusted each other and could—and did—speak our hearts freely about matters which interested us both.

Mr. Kempling was born in Hull in 1869 and wrote for many English newspapers and periodicals. Almost all his life he was especially interested in Shakspeare, a subject on which he wrote many newspaper articles and some essays. With each issue of the *Bulletin* the *Stratford-on-Avon Herald* carried an appreciative notice of our work. To Americans he is probably best known by his little book, *The Shakespeare Memorials of London*. In his last years he was planning a book—*In Shakspeare's Name*—in which he would have recorded his impressions of the many Shakspeare lovers he had known in the flesh and in spirit. But, alas! that is not to be.

AN EMENDATION IN KING LEAR

There is a passage in *King Lear* which, notwithstanding its currency with most modern editors is, when

properly considered, utterly unacceptable. Edmund, planning to displace Edgar from their father's favor, says, according to the early Quartos:

"and [= if] my invention thrive,
Edmund the base shall tooth legitimate I grow, I prosper,".

In the Folio the passage which corresponds to this is printed (as verse) thus.

"And my invention thrive, Edmund the base

"Shall to' th' Legitimate I grow, I prosper:".

The first two eighteenth-century editors seem to have been quite satisfied with the Folio text; but in his second edition (1728) Pope made Edmund say that he would "be th' legitimate," although nothing in the world could make him so. In his vitriolic *Canons of Criticism* Thomas Edwards approved of Capell's suggestion that we read "top the legitimate" and most editors since then have so read, mainly because they think that Shakspeare wrote "top" as a kind of opposition to "base" in the preceding verse and because Capell saw in "top" a connection with the words "I grow." Some editors, however, had sufficient acquaintance with Shakspeare's ways not to be taken in by Capell's logic; they saw that "top th' legitimate" does not fit into Shaksperian verse. A few editors read "to th' legitimate" and interpret it—wilfully and indefensibly—as meaning "advance to or take the place of the legitimate" (Nichols). Other suggestions too have been made but they do not deserve to be mentioned here. The German translators, for example, treat the sentence as unfinished or they substitute some word like "stürzen" for the puzzling "to."

Hanmer long ago suggested substituting "toe" (as a verb) for the early "too" and "to" with the meaning "to come up to and be on even ground with [Edgar]," but he could not cite a parallel usage of the word, nor does it seem likely that this is what Edmund intends. Malone adopted "toe" because he had been informed that in Devonshire "to toe a thing up is to tear it up by the roots," even though "to toe" is not "to toe up."

That "toe" is Shakspeare's word is absolutely certain. Dr. Johnson (not quoted by Furness!) so understood the passage; his comment was "To *toe* him, is perhaps to *kick* him out, . . . or . . . to *supplant* him." True, no dictionary known to me so defines the word prior to Shakspeare's use of it in this sense, but we know that Shakspeare constantly indulged in new coinages and new usages. To cite examples of this is surely unnecessary when writing for professed Shaksperians, although it may be mentioned as at least a curious coincidence that Shakspeare seems to have been the first to use the word "foot" in the sense of "to spurn" (*Merchant of Venice*, I, iii, 119). The spelling "toe" is really only a modernization in orthography, inasmuch as "too" was common and correct spelling for "toe" throughout the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. (See the *Oxford Dictionary*.) That conservative Shakspeare so spelled the word is fairly inferable from the fact that in the 1609 Quartos of *Troilus and Cressida*—another play in all probability printed from his manuscript—we find (in IV, v, 15) the following: "He rises on the too". The word "base" suggests "toe" to Edmund, and the thought of kicking Edgar out so exhilarates him that he exclaims, "I grow! I prosper!"

SHAKSPERE AND JAPAN

As a rule we expect nothing good to come out of Japan nowadays. But there are exceptions to most rules, says another rule. And we are happy to inform our readers that a good (that is, a worthwhile and useful) book on the god of our idolatry has just come out of Japan. It is entitled *Shakespeare in Japan: An Historical Survey* and is the work of a real scholar and lover of the great English poet, Dr. Minoru Toyoda (the latter being his surname), professor of English literature in the Imperial University of Kyushu. The book, consisting of some 150 pages, is nicely printed, in large, clear type, bound in boards (gold lettered), is issued by the Shakespeare Association of Japan, and is appropriately dedicated to the memory of Dr. Tsubouchi, "the first, and so far the only, translator of Japanese of the complete works of Shakespeare." Unlike so many other English books on Shakspeare by foreigners, especially Frenchmen and Germans, this one is well and interestingly written, without any barbarisms and the usual "howlers." It is worthy of special mention that as a result of financial support from the Cultural Work Bureau of the Japanese Foreign Office gift copies of this book will be presented to such "institutions and societies" in various parts of the world as may ask for it.

Dr. Toyoda discusses his subject in eight chapters, the first dealing with "the gradual approach to Shakespeare" in the 19th century, the second with early foreign professors of English literature, the third and fourth with translations, the fifth with stories and Japanese adaptations, the sixth with biographies and critical Japanese histories of English literature, the eighth with Shakspeare on the

Japanese stage since his first appearance there (with *The Merchant of Venice*!) in 1885. This is followed (pages 121-139) by what is the most valuable part of the book for us, even though the subject is not treated exhaustively, a bibliography of Japanese Shaksperiana.

We extend our sincerest congratulations to all who had anything to do with the publication of this highly desirable and well-made book.

THE HAMLET - LAERTES BOUT

There are many *Hamlet* problems which will not down. One of the most obstreperous of these is the fencing bout between Laertes and the hero in the last act of the play. The most recent essay to explain the terms and technique of the bout is that of Mr. Horace S. Craig who discusses "Duelling Scenes and Terms in Shakespeare's Plays" in the ninth volume (pages 1 to 28) of the *University of California Publications in English*. With great cock-sureness the author discourses on the theory and practice of the duel in the Elizabethan period, Shakspeare's technical knowledge of dueling, and the various references to dueling in Shakspeare's plays. The essay ends with a very useful "vocabulary of Elizabethan dueling and fencing terms."

Undoubtedly the author has read much and thought much on the subject and his work deserves careful consideration, even though in our estimation he has not solved the *Hamlet* problem and has seriously impaired the value of his work by having failed to read Miss Guttman's essay on "The Fencing Bout in *Hamlet*" which was published in the April 1939 issue of this *Bulletin*.

Mr. Craig's explanation of the exchange of "weapons" is expressed in the following words (pp. 21-22): "Is

it imagining too much to see Laertes, desperate in his failure to pink Hamlet in the course of a "phrase d'armes," leap at his foe who is standing, foil point on the floor, unprepared, while Osric is saying, "Nothing neither way" Laertes cries, "Have at you now," and before Hamlet realizes that he is reattacked, the poisoned tip has torn into his arm or body. In the flurry of performing this despicable act, Laertes drops his weapon in his haste to get away and Hamlet drops his at the unexpected shock of steel ripping his flesh. In the mad scramble that follows, Laertes in panic and Hamlet in a rage, each retrieves the other's foil." That this explanation will satisfy anyone but the author of it may well be doubted. That Mr. Craig's notions about the scenes are somewhat muddled may be inferred from his remark (p. 21) that "there has been no satisfactory explanation of why Laertes should attempt to exchange swords [!] with Hamlet."

2 HENRY IV

With the financial assistance of the Carnegie Corporation and the American Philosophical Society, and under the sponsorship of the Modern Language Association of America, the J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia has recently published Dr. Matthias A. Shaaber's edition of the second part of Shakspeare's *Henry IV*, the twenty-third volume in the Furness Variorum. Even after only a casual examination of the book we are prepared to say that this is one of the best, fattest, and most serviceable volumes in the series. Dr. Shaaber has devoted years to the careful study of the play and the meticulous preparation of the book along the lines marked out by the famous and incomparable Horace Howard Furness.

Accordingly, we find here not only

the text of the play (the quarto text collated with the Folio), the textual varia (including emendations) directly beneath the text, and interpretative comments on single words and passages below these. In the course of years this arrangement has proved to be not only the most logical but the most practical. The editor claims to have made frequent use of the *Oxford Dictionary* in finding the exact meaning of obscure locutions which had not previously been explained to his satisfaction.

Following the text of the play is a long and minute discussion of the two primary texts and their relationship to each other. Dr. Shaaber argues for the theory that the quarto was printed from Shakspeare's own manuscript of the play and that the Folio text was printed from a transcript "made by [Ralph] Crane or by some other professional scribe of similar working habits"—a conclusion which is sufficiently cautious to be generally acceptable. In the appendix dealing with the "sources" of the play, there are adequate extracts from *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* (with comments on them by reputed critics), from Holinshed's *Chronicles* (again with comments), from Hall, from Stow, from Elyot, and from Samuel Daniel. Then follow some eighty-six pages of selections from the commentators. The Dering manuscript, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library, receives careful consideration in six pages. A short section (five pages) is devoted to "acting versions" and another (four pages) to a record of performances. Twenty-one pages of closely printed matter are required to list the books the editor has consulted in the preparation of this valuable contribution to Shaksperian scholarship. An unusually good index (thirty-three pages) winds up the book.

That the book is perfect we will not say. Undoubtedly it would be fairly easy to look for fly-speck imperfections and to find them. Thus, for example, we object to listing names in the index—e.g., "Bensley (actor)," "Berry (actor)"—without giving their easily-ascertainable initials. And why is there nowhere a note on the proper pronunciation of the name "Bolingbroke," considering how uniformly this name is mispronounced? And why has nothing been said about the metrical evidence for the date of composition? And, finally, why does Professor Adams, the general editor, permit the depiction of a coat-of-arms on the covers which is not Shakspeare's? Would it be possible to secure somewhere a grant of \$1.50 for a new cut which would show the arms correctly?

SIR JOHN DAVIES

The Columbia University Press has just published a volume of facsimiles of the rare first editions of Sir John Davies's *Poems*, including his *Epigrammes and Elegies*, his *Orchestra, or, A Poem of Dauncing*, his famous *Nosce Teipsum*, his *Hymns of Astraea*, and his *Gulling Sonnets*. The book (consisting of 260 pages and priced at \$3.) is ushered in with an easily readable though scholarly introduction by Dr. Clare Howard, Assistant Professor of English at Columbia University, and is rounded out with twenty pages of notes. The editor expresses the hope that the volume will be useful to the "learned" and pleasing to the "lewed," but we have our doubts as to this. The facsimile of the first 108 pages is so small (though undoubtedly the size of the original) and the letters are so broken and imperfect that we doubt that any would-be reader will take the trouble to decipher the text. Scholars, on the other hand, will be seriously disappointed

in a "bibliography" consisting of eighteen items.

A UNIQUE KING LEAR

Recently we had the privilege to witness a performance of *King Lear* which in many ways proved to be a source of unusual pleasure and satisfaction, though we went to the theatre expecting to be terribly disappointed if not disgusted. We came away thrilled and with a new sense of what wonders Shakspeare can contribute to the modern theatre if intelligence and artistry are brought into play in producing and interpreting his works. In this case the producer was Mr. Erwin Piscator and the interpreters were a group of some well-known and some less well-known actors constituting the Dramatic Workshop of the New School and functioning in the Studio Theatre on West 12th Street. The cast, an excellent one of fine-looking persons, included Mr. Sam Jaffe as King Lear, Miss Rachel Adams as Generil, Miss Margaret Curtis as Regan (and what a malevolent Regan she was!), Mr. Enford Gage as Edgar (another magnificent portrayal), Mr. Roger de Koven as Edmund (fine and convincing toward the end of the play), Mr. Herbert Ranson as Kent (somewhat weak and too often inaudible, but picturesque), Mr. Ross Matthew as Gloster (he seemed to be the man himself), Miss Lysbeth Lynn as Cordelia (unconvincing, lacking in pathetic appeal), and Mr. Herbert Berghof as the Fool. The last was badly handicapped by his foreign accent but, notwithstanding this, he gave a most satisfying and pity-provoking performance; the ventriloquist's puppet which he employed as the medium through which to shoot his critical shafts at Lear was novel, perhaps startlingly so, but quite effective.

New York critics objected to this innovation but it was really not so novel as they thought it to be: a steel engraving in the first volume of Sir Walter Scott's 1810-edition of the *Ancient British Drama* shows a court-fool with such a puppet. Mr. Berghof scored heavily with his pathetic death from exposure at the end of the scene on the heath (during which he never ceased to cling affectionately to his manikin.)

The text was, as usual and necessarily, greatly abridged, but this was done so judiciously that only the Shakspeare specialist would have been conscious of a want of continuity. To this auditor the only objectionable features in the text were the introduction into it—because of Mr. Piscator's desire to give the play a modern meaning—of a symbolic prologue (consisting of the Cain-Abel story in pantomime) and of part of Ulysses' speech (*Troilus & Cressida*, I, iii, 119-24) as the closing lines of the play (spoken by Edgar).

Certain features of this production provoked considerable debate. First, there was the revolving stage which consisted of six or seven (we did not count them) oval platforms one above the other, each one smaller (in length and breadth) than the one below; this, looked at from the front, gave the impression of a flight of steps leading up into the sky. The steps were (or seemed) somewhat too high for comfortable ascent or descent and looked as though they might prove dangerous for the actors who had to go up and down and across them. The revolving feature was not only wholly unexceptionable but materially aided the movement of the drama.

Another novel feature of this production was the introduction of sound effects calculated to heighten the

sonority of Lear's outbursts in the storm, etc. To some in the audience this seemed very objectionable; to us it seemed, both theoretically and practically, a perfectly legitimate resort to any modern technical device calculated to heighten the artistry of the poet's grand conception.

The third most striking feature was the introduction of a ballet (at the opening of scene 3), which was considerably overdone, for the purpose of seemingly justifying Goneril's indignation and resentment at the riotous

behavior of Lear and his hundred knights.

Of Mr. Jaffe's Lear we can say only that in his outbursts of rage and in his mad scenes he was every inch a king and that he often moved his audience to great pity for the sufferings of the outraged father and the impotent "fond, old man." The scene of Lear's death would have been much more effective had Lear died in an ecstasy of belief that his Cordelia was alive, instead of dying in despair as he tries to listen to her breathing.

COMMUNICATION:

WHICH DANIEL?

Editor of the *Bulletin*:

Respectfully, may I comment on "A Daniel Come to Judgment" in the October issue of our *Bulletin*? That the Daniel of *The Merchant of Venice* is not the Daniel of the Jewish Book of Daniel, but is the Daniel of whom the Jews knew nothing, the Daniel of the Play being the Daniel of the Greek apocrypha, Susanna's Daniel, is the theme and the judgment of that article. Admiring the scholarship, may I presume to dissent from the judgment? The Daniel of the play was introduced by Shylock, a supposedly orthodox Jew, well-schooled in the canon. I cite Shylock himself as the main authority against the article.

The speech and behavior of Daniel of the Jewish and Aramaic *Book of Daniel* are dramatically analogous to those of Portia. The high-bred Jewish captive was the reviver and interpreter of the King's forgotten dream; Portia is the high-bred reviver and interpreter of Venice's forgotten enactment. Daniel was the interpreter and clarifier of a cryptic inscription; Portia the inter-

preter and clarifier of an ambiguous legal complex made up of a narrow racial (and old) ordinance which conflicted with the universal Law Merchant of Venice, an international port, perplexing to an ordinary judge. Daniel and Portia were called into their respective rôles unexpectedly. No one else was available or competent; both were welcomed at first by their respective prospective victims. "Then the King Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped 'Daniel,'" (*The Book of Daniel*, I, i.) "A Daniel come to judgment! Yea, a Daniel! O wise young judge, how do I honor thee!" exclaims Shylock (IV, 1), echoing the other Jewish captive and prophet, Ezekiel. Portia's first pronouncement was favorable to Shylock; after her final judgment, Shylock, appalled, gasps, "Is that the law?" (*Ibid.*) Gratiano screams: "A second Daniel! A Daniel, Jew! Now infidel I have thee on the hip." . . . "A Daniel, still say I, a second Daniel! I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." (IV, 2) "Give me my money and let me go," says humbled Shy-

lock. O no, says Portia, the law has another hold on you; you're an alien who has attempted to murder a citizen, and your life is the forfeit. "In that night Belshazzar the Chaldean King was slain." (V. 30.)

The parallelism, I think, between Portia and the orthodox Daniel is greater than that between Portia and the so-called other Daniel. It was close enough to make clear the significance of both Shylock's and Gratiano's exclamations. Indeed, I find nothing at all in common between Portia's part in the play and Daniel's vindication of the virtuous Susanna. Shylock was making no false accusations against Antonio, as were the two perjurers against the hapless Susanna. Susanna's case is relatively melodramatic and commonplace; Shylock held a forfeited bond, with a leading merchant's seal on it, pledging a pound of flesh.

The theme of the *Bulletin* article is that there were two Daniels, of disparate talents and personalities, and that Shakspeare ineptly picked the wrong Daniel, presumably not knowing about the right one. Dr. Goodspeed,¹ however, says that the canonical and the apocryphal Daniels are the same man, and that the Bel and Dragon chapters are clearly suggested by narratives in Daniel itself. All the older non-Jewish Bibles identified them as one and in the *Book* or *Prophecy of Daniel* the Douai Version still does just that.

"It is known that the reference [in the play] is not to the canonical Book of Daniel but to the apocryphal History of Susanna," says the article. Known to whom, pray? Is the knowledge a secret, held by a select few? Where is the proof, on the proof

record, that Shylock had ever heard of Susanna or her clever young detective cross-examiner Daniel? Did not Shylock, as a faithful Jewish scripture reader, know all that the canon reveals about the Chaldean King's wise and courageous young Jewish interpreter, Daniel of the canon?

"Shakspeare was not well posed in Jewish life," says the article. If this is put forward as an established fact, it is news to some of us. Perhaps it is merely an opinion, if so it should be so stated. Of Shaksperian settled facts there are few. Of Shaksperian opinions the supply is inexhaustible, luxuriant and varied. The fact that William Shakspeare had given the names Susanna and Judith to his daughters might well justify the opinion that he knew about Susanna and Judith from the *Bible*, it would scarcely sustain the belief that he had never heard of the great Daniel.

The name Daniel, to Jew and Christian alike meaning the judgment or the wisdom of God, suited the Globe Theatre Company's purpose. That name was common among Jews and Gentiles. *Vide* George Eliot's Daniel Deronda.

Respecting the Ugaritic forms, and speaking with no disrespect, (it seems far-fetched to suggest that Shakspeare could have meant (or his audiences understood) the Daniel referred to by Shylock and Gratiano as the Ugarit hero, the remote, shadowy forerunner of Susanna's Daniel, discriminating between that obscure Daniel and the famous dream-reader, cryptic interpreter and lion-tamer

JOHN E. HANNIGAN.

¹How Came the Bible, 1940.

April, 1941

Vol. XVI, No. 2

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



The Rebirth of Tragedy

"The Lunatic, the Lover and the Poet"

Raw Materials For a Shakspeare Biography

Images in the *Faerie Queene* Drawn From
Flora and Fauna

Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 118th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET

New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH

15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.

Major Edward Bowes

Hleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.

Hardin Craig, Ph.D.

Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.

Frank Gilmore

Walter Hampden

Frank J. Hogan

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.

George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.

Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.

Fritz Leiber

Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.

Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.

John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.

Julia Marlowe, LL.D.

Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.

Mrs. Robert Carleton Morris, Ph.M.

Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.

Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.

Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.

Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.

Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Otis Skinner, A.M.

Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.

John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison

70 Broadway

New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum

601 West 113th Street

New York

Board of Directors

1926

John Robert Gregg

Paul Kaufman

Robert M. Smith

Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1927

Miss Olive I. Carter

Arthur Haine

Frank L. Short

Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1928

George W. Davison

John E. Hannigan

John H. H. Lyon

Miss Charlotte E. Porter

A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$3 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON

VOL. XVI

APRIL, 1941

No. 2

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------------------------|
| The Rebirth of Tragedy | <i>William Van O'Connor</i> 67 |
| "The Lunatic, The Lover and The Poet" | <i>M. Ellwood Smith</i> 77 |
| Images in <i>The Faerie Queene</i> Drawn from Flora and Fauna, <i>Grace Warren Landrum</i> | 89 |
| Performances of Shaksperian Plays at Covent Garden and Drury Lane Theaters, <i>Margaret Ruth Lewery</i> | 102 |
| Raw Materials for a Shakspeare Biography | <i>Samuel A. Tannenbaum</i> 104 |
| A Borrowing from Caviceo for the Legend of Romeo and Juliet, <i>William F. J. DeJongh</i> | 118 |
| Notes on Shylock, Angelo and Falstaff | <i>A. S. Pushkin</i> 120 |
| <i>Communications:</i> | |
| Notes on Shylock, Angelo and Falstaff | <i>Albert Ségal</i> 122 |
| A Second Daniel | <i>Robert Withington</i> 123 |
| The Fencing Match in Hamlet | <i>Allan H. Gilbert</i> 124 |
| How Much of Shakspeare Did Voltaire Know? | <i>Percy G. Adams</i> 126 |
| Editorial Notes and Comments | <i>S. A. T</i> 127 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October. by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies. fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE REBIRTH OF TRAGEDY

By WILLIAM VAN O'CONNOR

PERHAPS we have passed beyond the years when psychology was "the thing," the years in which man was a guinea pig in human form. In glancing backwards we can attempt to see what effect the "temper" of a psychology-conscious era had on tragedy. One cannot, obviously, blame the psychologists for having belittled man! theirs was the "science" which lent itself most easily to "proving that man was a bundle of reflexes, complexes, hormones and chromosones who could be played upon like an intricate musical instrument." The "sounds" that came out of him depended on the nature of the twitch and noise the expert wanted to effect.

It was, and no doubt still is, the belief of many that tragedy is a genre that is dead, a part of a past world which believed in the nobility of man. These people can understand how tragedy was written in the Renaissance, for Renaissance man was preoccupied with the evil of sin and man's rising superior to it. "Such a drama developed because it could not be otherwise. Elizabethan tragedy originally sprang from Seneca, himself a moralist. It accorded with the Christian and largely medieval sentiments of its authors and audience and, incidentally, justified itself before the formidable Puritan censor by its moral tone. No subject was more thrilling than sin."¹ Sin was one of the chief ways in which a hostile and heavy fate was brought into activity against man. Faustus falls before a revenging justice; and Macbeth's tragedy, of course, arose from an ambition that led him into great sins. Lust, murder, corruption, degeneracy were the prime movers of tragedy. The chief character in Elizabethan tragedy is "a sufferer who is fallible but who enlists our sympathy because of a greatness of heart. We associate ourselves with the tragic victim, as ourselves offered by vicarious sacrifice upon the altar of the stage, and find our hearts redeemed and our fears softened by awareness of the majesty of this atonement."² The basis, then, for almost all Elizabethan tragedy is morality, man's failure to observe one or more of the moral laws, and the tragic hero's recog-

nition of his fault before his ultimate downfall. But, say and said, some of our contemporaries, if man is not responsible for his acts how can he choose between morality and immorality—in brief, how can we consider anyone either noble or ignoble?

Some years ago Professor Krutch, associated with *The Nation*, most forward-looking of the intellectual journals, wrote a book entitled *The Modern Temper*, a book which caused considerable stir in undergraduate classrooms and, no doubt, an equal furor in the more "profound" discussion groups of graduates and social commentators. The illusions of the nineteenth century had gone and the men of the nineteen hundreds who had unmasked the illusions had "begun to doubt that rationality and knowledge have any promised land into which they may be led." Mark Van Doren put it thus:

"There is a game for players still to play,
Pretending that the board was never lost,
But still the painted counters will decay
And knowledge sit alone to count the cost."

One unmasked illusion—that man was a noble being—threatened to destroy the great art of dramatic and literary tragedy. Indeed, said Professor Krutch in *The Tragic Fallacy*, the reconciliation to life by means of the tragic spirit is . . . now only a fiction surviving in art. When that art itself has become meaningless, when we have ceased not only to write but to *read* tragic works, then it will be lost and in all real senses forgotten, since the devolution from Religion to Art to Document will be complete (p. 143).

Krutch calls us (1) an "emotionally enfeebled" people. Beside the works of Shakspeare or Sophocles, he asks us to set such contemporary dramas as *The Ghosts* and *The Weavers*. Obviously there is only contrast in the magnitude of the Greek and Elizabethan works and the respective works of Ibsen and Hauptmann. Shakspeare's "conception of human dignity, his sense of the importance of human passions, his vision of the amplitude of human life simply did not and could not exist for Ibsen, as they did not and could not exist for his contemporaries" (p. 117). He would have

us contrast *Hamlet* ("in understanding, how like a god!") with Oswald Alving who "has inherited syphilis from his father." It will be recalled that when Oswald learns the truth about his condition he "persuades his mother to poison him." The incidents prove, perhaps, that pastors should not endeavor to keep a husband and wife together unless they know what they are doing. But what a world is this in which a great writer can deduce nothing more than that from his greatest work and how are we to be purged or reconciled when we see it acted? Not only is the failure utter, but it is trivial as well (p. 132).

(2) He believes that we cannot agree with Aristotle that there are "noble" actions, for "no one knows what a *noble* action is or whether or not such a thing as nobility exists in nature apart from the mind of man" (p. 121).

(3) "A too sophisticated society," he continues, which "has outgrown not merely the simple optimism of the child but also that vigorous, one might almost say adolescent, faith in the nobility of man which marks Sophocles or Shakespeare, has neither fairy tales to assure it that all is always right in the end nor tragedies to make it believe that it rises superior in soul to the outward calamities which befall it" (p. 128).

(4) Lastly, Krutch has written: "the tragic spirit sustains itself by an assumption" that is not "justified;" in tragedy man is seen "Occupying the exact center of a universe which would have no meaning except for him." "His passions are important throughout all time and space; the very fact that he can sin (no modern can) means that this universe is watching his acts; and though he may perish, a God leans out from his infinity to strike him down. And it is exactly because Ibsen cannot think of man in any such terms as these that his persons have so shrunk that his 'tragedy' has lost that power which real tragedy always has of making that infinitely ambitious creature man content to accept his misery if only he can be made to feel great enough and important enough. An Oswald is not a Hamlet chiefly because he has lost that tie with the supernatural world which the latter had" (pp. 34-35).

One may easily be reminded today in reading the essay by Professor Krutch of a poem in which a contemporary commentator has T. S. Eliot walk to the top of a promontory. Behind him is Desolation, the land through which he has come; he knows he cannot go back. Before him is Nothingness. Does he leap headlong into the infinite blackness? No, he stands, or perhaps sits, there! There is no climax. The life of Eliot goes on—just sitting there on the promontory. (This was written, of course, before Eliot decided to heed the church bells. And it is quite possible that Eliot's about-face may be an indication that the intellectual world is to see a reaffirmation in the powers of man.) And lesser lives than that of Eliot go on. People go on because they hope. Maxwell Anderson, in terms of tragedies for the contemporary stage, puts it thus: "An audience watching a play will go along with it [the tragedy] only when it considers a higher moral impulse than moved him [the central character] at the beginning of the story, though the audience will of course define morality as it pleases and in terms of its own day. It may be that there is no absolute up or down in this world, but the race believes that there is, and will not hear of any denial." It took Anderson a series of autumnal failures to learn this: that a chief character must be *noble*, must see his past failure and change for the better; otherwise the stage "tragedy" will fail. But before we return to the book from which we have just now quoted,⁸ to the theories of this currently successful writer of tragedies, let us attempt to evaluate the validity of the reasons Professor Krutch has proffered as the basis for his belief that tragedy will one day be a lost art.

In asking us to contrast Ibsen and Shakspeare Professor Krutch is asking us to put a distinguished dramatist next to a Promethean; the former wrote serious plays, the latter wrote "pure tragedy." One can likewise put the works of Jonson, or Middleton, or Marston beside those of Shakspeare and be forced to conclude that these works, too, are not only failures but "trivial as well." Middleton, to take one example from among Shakspeare's contemporaries, wrote in a disillusioned vein; he was scornful rather than sympathetic, he wrote of ignoble, despicable figures. He chose to

ignore, or perhaps did not see, the heroic. With such limited subject matter, limited even as Ibsen's was limited, it was impossible for Middleton to become a great tragic writer. One of the keen observations of Maxwell Anderson is relevant here: "In [Shakspeare's] *Troilus and Cressida* Troilus discovers that Cressida is a light woman. He draws from her defection the inference that all women are faithless—that faith in woman is the possession of fools. As a consequence he turns away from life and seeks death [?] in a cause as empty as the love he has given up, the cause of the strumpet Helen. All the glory of Shakespeare's verse cannot rescue the play for an audience, and save in *Macbeth* Shakespeare nowhere wrote so richly, so wisely, or with such a flow of brilliant metaphor" (p. 11). Here Shakspeare was following a contemporary fad—a type of drama that Jonson had called "comicall satyre."⁴ If he had continued to write in this satiric vein we can only guess to what position among the minor dramatists he would be consigned today.

Secondly, it makes little difference whether or not "nobility exists in nature apart from the mind of man." Man is not concerned with nature except in so far as it affects his well-being. And when Mr. Krutch says "no one knows what a *noble* action is," it seems that he means man is conditioned by his environment, or as T. S. Eliot once put it, man "is turned by that which he thinks he turns." His physical and mental gifts are from the great god Chance; and a given set of circumstances, as the psychologists like to put it, will affect a given individual in a definite way. Therefore man is neither to be blamed nor rewarded for what he does or does not do. Which, of course, as far as it goes, is probably true. But if the immediate stimuli causing any given result are changed the resultant action is likewise changed. If an individual, for example, recognizing that the stimuli or environment affecting him can be changed for the better, and he moves to change it, thereby "righting a wrong," then we view such a choice as a victory of the mind over nature. And if the individual loses his life in learning this and in changing his environment, he becomes for us a tragic hero. The *stage* version of *The Fifth Column* offers us a young man who awakens to the importance of his giving his life

to fighting against a vicious system. His own past cynicism is burned out in the powerful emotions that urge this dedication. *Key Largo* has for its tragic hero a man who wars within himself for having betrayed the confidence of a group of young idealists who had respected him. He, too, gives his life in an effort to restore decency to a little piece of the world.

The old Hemingway, the man intoxicated with a sense of rough masculinity and brute, unrestricted force, has in his latest book turned his back on the cynical temper of the 'twenties. His newest, and likely his best, fictional hero, Robert Jordan, takes his place beside Tom Joad, Mio, Abraham Lincoln, and all tragic heroes, who, having been conquered, die unconquered. There is a brief hesitation, a moment in which the older spirit of the 'twenties comes in conflict with the new; Robert Jordan is soliloquizing as he lies under a tree on a Spanish battleground: "Don't get cynical. The time is too short and you have just sent her away. Each one does what he can. You can do nothing for yourself but perhaps you can do something for another." His act of faith follows: "I have fought for what I believed in for a year now. If we win here we will win everywhere. The world is a fine place and worth the fighting for and I hate very much to leave it . . . You've had as good a life as any because of these last days. You do not want to complain when you have been so lucky. I wish there was some way to pass on what I've learned. Christ, I was learning fast there at the end." In the death of Robert Jordan the world sustains a great loss: he has the capacity for understanding and seems, at his death, to have been approaching a state of mind where he can fathom the war and his part in it; he endures his suffering courageously for a single purpose, to kill another rebel soldier—"And if you wait and hold them up even a little while, or just get that officer, that may make all the difference. One thing well done can make . . ." He has approached an understanding of the evil in his immediate world, he sees himself as a part of humanity; and the reader comes to know "for whom the bell tolls"—for humanity in him.

Thirdly, every individual and every age differs in the quality and the nature of the faith we put in our fellows.

Doubtless leisurely post-war America had less faith in man's nobility and power than most ages have had. But not even Shakspeare, contrary to Mr. Krutch's statement, accepted the dictum that in the end "all is always right." Nor does anyone have to believe it to have faith "in the nobility of man." But, apparently, in the latter part of the nineteen-thirties (and it may likewise prove to be true of the nineteen-forties) there was, and is, a growing belief in the ability of man to "rise superior to the outward calamities which befall" him. One need only to witness the success and the acclaim with which Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* has been received to know that there are thousands in contemporary America who believe that there are many Tom Joads who have the capacity for lifting themselves above their circumstances, though they lose their lives in doing it. While it is not a tragedy, *The World We Make*, dramatized from a story by Millen Brand, in its very title is indicative of a new spirit on the American stage. A young woman, deemed to be incurably insane, escapes from a hospital, and comes to New York City. Courageously she fights off a belief that had driven her mad. Tiring her body in strenuous work, attempting an adjustment with a normal world, she moves toward a victory over the irrational fears that had unset her mind. Years of suffering are rewarded by what she knows to be a permanent return to sanity.

The last of Mr. Krutch's statements—that man has "lost that power which real tragedy always has of making that infinitely ambitious creature man content to accept his misery if only he can be made to feel great enough and important enough"—is the gravest fallacy in his entire thesis on "The Tragic Fallacy." It is not necessary to believe that one's actions or "passions are important throughout all time and space." It is enough that one's actions are important here and now, among one's fellows, that they typify society's struggle and efforts to improve its collective lot.

A corollary to this is even more important: whereas sin was the factor that motivated Renaissance tragedy, in our current tragedy the *irrational* has taken the place of *sin*. Hitherto the tragic hero had to rise above his sin, today the

tragic hero must conquer the irrational, must understand. Maxwell Anderson writes: "The hero who is to make the central discovery in a play must have some variation of what Aristotle calls a tragic fault—and the reason he must have it is that when he makes his discovery he must change both in himself and in his action. The fault can be a very simple one—a mere unawareness, for example . . ." In *Abe Lincoln in Illinois* the discovery is made by Lincoln "that he has been a coward, that he has stayed out of the fight for the Union because he was afraid." This produces a "profound emotional effect" on Lincoln and "gives an entirely new direction to the play" (*op. cit.*, p. 7). Lincoln finally reached an understanding within himself, the realization that he could and would bring order out of chaos. In that realization he became noble.

Perhaps tragedy has now discovered itself once more, after (as Mr. Krutch has been so painfully aware) an age of despair. In glancing backwards we can see that dramatists and novelists had to wait for several years after feeling the first impact of the depression-world before they could recognize the advent of a new body of beliefs. Perhaps Maxwell Anderson's *Winterset* (1935) was the first drama to set the contemporary theatre in a hitherto unperceived direction. Breadlines, poverty; the shadow of disaster was in the murky atmosphere over the bridgehead, and over the dreary little world that Mio came upon one December morning. In search of revenge for his father's death, he found instead an understanding of the futility of his hatreds:

'I think I'm waking from a long trauma of hate and fear and death that's hemmed me from my birth—and glimpse of life to be lived in hope—but it's young in me yet, I can't get free, or forgive! But teach me how to live and forget to hate!

Miriamne. He would have forgiven.

Mio. He?

Miriamne. Your father.

Mio. Yes. You'll think it strange, but I've never remembered that . . . I came here seeking light in darkness, running from the dawn, and stumbled on a morning."

And with Mio's personal understanding a new day was

born, during which the rational mind was seen to strive toward mastery of the irrational.

Such contemporary writers as Max Lerner and C. G. Jung tell us—the former explicitly, the latter implicitly—that the intellectual movement of our day is the attempt to understand the irrational. Man, with his rational powers, is striving to comprehend, as far as that may be possible, his own irrational acts, the irrationality of certain political and social systems. Such a design for understanding is implicit in our national consciousness of propaganda as a force against which the rational mind must fight. We must fight irrationality with rationality. Tom Joad, Oklahoma born, looks up at the California fruit grower and says, "What's all this talk about reds? What's a red?" unaware that it was a word that could be used as a weapon against him, a weapon far more powerful than a club. He is trying to understand, so he may rise superior to the forces that threaten to beat him down. Tom's joining with the pickers in their efforts to unionize is his first great step toward enlightenment. Soon, he recognizes that he as an individual is important only in that he can help to right a tremendous wrong. In him the contemporary reader sees man once again superior to his environment. He does not have to be a "superior" being—we no longer believe that a man has to be in a high station in life to be a nobleman—to be a truly tragic figure. He may be an uneducated laborer attempting to set right injustices. He may make mistakes that will cause his head to be bashed in. But if he can see his errors, even though he has failed to master the hostile forces which he at last understands, then he is no less a truly tragic figure than is Lear, or Othello, or Hamlet, or Coriolanus. The reader sees in Joad, when he walks over the hilltop in the dawn to take part in labor struggles, an indomitable figure, one of those "infinitely ambitious creatures," who knows that though he will perish he will be victorious in his defeat. And with this rebirth of contemporary tragedy has come, as might be expected, an intense renewal of interest in Shakspeare on the New York stage.

It no longer seems that the art of Tragedy is ineluctably

declining, moving quickly along the path which leads from "Religion to Art to Document." To a contemporary Broadway audience *Julius Caesar* in modern dress was not an anachronism, but an anti-fascist play whose hero was similar in one important respect to contemporary tragic heroes. The tragic hero of Robert Sherwood's *The Petrified Forest* once had sold himself to a wealthy "art-loving" woman; but, having recognized his fault, he knew he would never prostitute himself again. Rather, he would give his life to make it possible for a young girl to live a fruitful, happy life as an artist. Brutus had, and held to, a similar concept of personal dignity. He had erred in aiding the envious murderers of Caesar; but, having erred, he would not further cheapen himself by robbery:

"For I can raise no money by vile means —
By heaven, I had rather coin my heart,
And drop my blood for drachmas, than to wring
From the hard hands of peasants their vile trash
By any indirection . . ." (IV, iii, 71)

Maxwell Anderson asked, at the time of the production of *Winterset*, to have the play compared to *Hamlet*. Both Hamlet and Mio are obsessed with desire for revenge. There is a difference in the motivation of the plays: Hamlet has failed to fulfill the charge that Providence has laid upon him, until, as a result of his delays, he has caused the deaths of Polonius, Ophelia, the Queen, Laertes, and himself; Mio sees, too late, the futility of his hatred. The difference in the two plays is not *essential*. The Renaissance man fought against the evil of sin, the contemporary man fought against irrationality. The tragic hero of a Shakspeare or of a Maxwell Anderson have one important characteristic in common: in spite of their weaknesses, ultimately they triumph in spirit over the forces that destroy them.

Ohio State University, Derby Hall
Columbus, Ohio.

¹Henry W. Wells, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights*, 1939, p. 58.

²*Ibid.*, p. 15.

³Maxwell Anderson, *The Essence of Tragedy*, 1939.

⁴See O. J. Campbell, *Comical Satyre and Shakspeare's 'Troilus and Cressida'*, 1939.

"THE LUNATIC, THE LOVER AND THE POET"

By M. ELLWOOD SMITH

"And then, lastly, there is the man who perceives rightly in spite of his feelings, and to whom the primrose is forever nothing else than itself — the little flower, apprehended in the very plain and leafy fact of it, whatever and how many soever the associations and passions may be, that crowd around it."

ONE observes with a certain amusement that Shakspeare introduces among the personages of his dramas the figure of a poet only twice, and on both occasions to ridicule him; whereas the player, the vulgarities of whose profession he deprecates so feelingly, he presents directly and in allusion with evident partiality and often with what seems almost a wistful tenderness. It is also remarkable that the "poor player" who coveted the status of gentleman and got for himself a coat-of-arms, was also the playwright who made synthetic gentility ridiculous on the stage through the clown who boasted himself a gentleman born before his father.

Shakspeare could accept the advantages accorded by society to gentility, yet see clearly the artifice; he could long to be divorced from the contempt poured upon the players by Ben Jonson and the statutes, and yet feel loyally for their essential merit. Consistently by the side of personal feeling, like this longing for gentility, there existed dominantly at the same time a capacity to see things as they were, unaffected by bias or personal advantage. Stated baldly, this seems a small matter when related to some mean or individual consideration, such as personal advantage; but the man whose thinking is undeflected by personal advantage is not likely to be disturbed by emotions of other, less immediate, origin.

Shakspeare is the least sentimental of poets. Critics of Shakspeare have not been unsentimental. No soul ever had a more magnificent adventure bumping up against masterpieces than Hazlitt recreating Falstaff. But when the critic writes, "that it does not seem quite certain whether the

account of his hostess's bill, found in his pocket, with such an out-of-the-way charge for capons and sack with only one half-pennyworth of bread, was not put there by himself as a trick to humour the jest upon his favorite propensities, and as a conscious caricature of himself," we know that Hazlitt has gone beyond Shakspeare in the creation of a character.

It is unquestioned that Shakspeare had a warm spot in his heart for Falstaff. One might argue about Shakspeare's attitude toward his creation as Browning does in "Saul," when he makes David reason that if he, David, the imperfect creature, could love Saul so much, the all-inclusive and all-perfect Creator would love him more. One might argue that if Hazlitt the critic, and A. C. Bradley, and others could love Falstaff so much, Shakspeare would have loved him more. But Shakspeare does not fudge on fundamentals. Falstaff ended precisely where Falstaff with the propensities he possessed would have ended. There is no clearer indication of Shakspeare's intention than that to be found in the famous scene in which Falstaff has come up to London, assured that the young king is sick for him, and casually remarks, in the moment of his disappointment, "Master Shallow, I owe you a thousand pounds." As a closing episode Sir John has diddled Master Shallow. He is unregenerate and as such he is presented. From the glamorous high spirits of *Part I* with the young Prince through the more sordid associations of the hostess and Pistol of *Part II* to the touching illiteracy of his final obituary by the hostess, Sir John runs his course, unsentimentalized, inevitable. Who could have responded to popular demand and natural human sympathy, as it seems evident Shakspeare did in building up Sir John, without falsifying or yielding to the temptations which controlled Hazlitt and Bradley, except the poet who could provide adequately for Falstaff's demise in twenty lines by the hostess.

That Shakspeare saw differently from the critics perhaps accounts for the fact that one of his shrewdest strokes of humor is overlooked or condemned as brutal. Falstaff fights with the Douglas and falls down as if dead, to escape

further peril. The Prince fights with Hotspur, kills him, comments on the supposedly dead Falstaff, and withdraws. Falstaff cautiously rises, looks at the dead Percy, and exclaims, "How if he should counterfeit too and rise? By my faith, I am afraid he would prove the better counterfeit. Therefore I'll make him sure; yea, and I'll swear I killed him. *Why may not he arise as well as I?* Nothing confutes me but eyes, and nobody sees me. Therefore, sirrah [*stabbing him*], with a new wound in your side, come you along with me." Who but Falstaff could have imagined the fiery Percy resorting to such an ignoble subterfuge as feigning death to avoid danger? But Falstaff could imagine this, and the reason is clear, because that is what Falstaff not only would have done, but had done. To the sentimentalist the indignity done by Falstaff to Percy is intolerable. To the objective student of human nature the reasoning of Falstaff is incomparable.

Mr. Bradley conceived of Shakspeare as having built up Falstaff to the point where he could not tear him down again in the sympathies of his audience, with the consequence that we feel disappointed on the occasion of his rejection by his old companion become king. If we are so inclined, we can feel very rueful for "true Jack Falstaff," who has come up post haste in his loyal expectation of a perpetual round of open house only to be rebuffed by the king's, "I know thee not, old man; fall to thy prayers." Has Shakspeare unwittingly built up his character to so high a pitch of sympathy that it is impossible for the reader to experience the purely comic emotion at the end of the play obviously intended? The same question naturally arises at the end of the *Merchant of Venice* and of *Twelfth Night*.

Beginning with a mercenary, Shakspeare builds up his Shylock as the proud and resentful representative of a despised race, as a father whose sacred feelings have been exploited by Christians who do not scruple to pillage while they seduce, and finally as a husband whose most sacred memories have been desecrated.

Tubal: One of them showed me a ring that he had of your daughter for a monkey.

Shylock: Out upon her! Thou torturest me, Tubal: it was my turquoise; I had it of Leah when I was a bachelor; I would not have given it for a wilderness of monkeys

This unsurpassable combination of the pathetic and the grotesque, exhibiting in a line the full emotional range of Shylock's character, is immediately followed by:

Go, Tubal, fee me an officer: bespeak him a fortnight before.
I will have the heart of him, if he forfeit, for, were he out of Venice, I can make what merchandise I will.

Shakspere has built Shylock up into an intensely complex and human personality, and here in one line, as it were, he wrings his neck and reduces him to the mercenary with whom he began.

If we feel sorry at the end of the comedy for Falstaff, then we must feel sorry on similar grounds for Shylock, and I should add, at the end of *Twelfth Night*, for Malvolio. If "in the Falstaff scene he [Shakspere] overshot his mark," as Bradley believes, then we must infer that he also overshot the mark in Shylock and in Malvolio. Can it be that the mark at which Shakspere was shooting and the mark we set up for Shakspere are not one and the same?

It is true that many readers of *Twelfth Night* come away with a feeling of pity for Malvolio, but it is possible to imagine that Shakspere, at the end of the comedy, considered the clown's speech as tragic: "Why, 'some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrown upon them.' I was one, Sir, in this interlude; one Sir Topas, Sir; but that's all one. 'By the Lord, fool, I am not mad.' But do you remember? 'Madam, why laugh you at such a barren rascal? And you smile not, he's gagged;' and thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges"? Olivia declares that Malvolio has been notoriously abused and the Duke gives commands to pursue and entreat him to obedience, but the clown's talk remains the climax of the comedy. Can we seriously suppose that Shakspere intended Malvolio to be a pathetic figure, or to return, Shylock tragic? Just as in Falstaff, and in Shylock, Shakspere incorporated something of the universal; so too

in Malvolio, the complacent, he incorporated something which human nature reluctantly recognizes, ruefully it is true, as a portrait of itself. Who can declare that he has at all times resisted the incitements of flattery and self-love? Who can look back over his career and not find that most embarrassing moment when he arrayed himself in yellow stockings and cross-garters to his own fatuous admiration and the ridicule of the discerning? But can our own self-pity protect these characters from the disinterested regard of the Comic Spirit?

Dr. Stoll is right, incontrovertably right, in pointing to the fallacy of treating the characters of Shakspeare as if they were actual human beings. He seems wrong in pressing his theory of theatrical artifice to an extreme. Shakspeare was, of course, writing for the stage, not the closet. As a master craftsman he knew the artifices, the simplifications and condensations necessary for presenting his story on the stage. He was not concerned, it may be safely conceded, with text-book psychology. He was concerned with the effect that would be produced upon an audience. But the difference which exists between the plays of Shakspeare and those of the other craftsmen of Shakspeare's day, the Beaumonts and Fletchers of the Jacobean era, is one which prohibits acceptance of artifice as an explanation of Shaksperian genius. Michael Angelo, lying on his back for four years painting the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, foreshortened and distorted in order that his design should be intelligible from the pavement sixty-eight feet below. In the same way Shakspeare adjusts and modifies psychology for the effect to be produced on the audience out in front. But one does not deny the fundamental truth in the Sistine murals because at close range the effect would be distortion. Nor need one deny in Shakspeare a regard for sound psychology because he modifies it and adapts it to produce the effect of truth through dramatic scenes. His peculiar triumph consists in his ability to harmonize convention and integrity of character. That is not falsification when he utilizes accepted conventions and simplifications to produce a truthful effect.

If, then, on the one hand, Shakspeare has not overshot the mark, has he, on the other, been guilty of arbitrary, artificial manipulation of his characters when he shifts Shylock from the tragic to the comic plane, Falstaff from the comic through the pathetic to the comic, or when he leaves Malvolio what some have found a pathetic and disturbing element in the climax of the comedy? May it not be possible that Shakspeare saw his characters more clearly and more completely, conceived his object as honestly, and achieved it as fully, as we can do for him? It is certain that Shakspeare conceived none of these characters sentimentally; that is, through the distorting medium of his personal sympathies and inclinations. Although simplified to the necessities of theatrical presentation, do we not find, on reflection, each drawn with a more certain regard for truth than can be detected in the conception that arises from our more subjective interpretation? That Shylock was a resentful member of a despised race, a father, and a husband, does not alter the fundamental fact that he was originally conceived as a money lender, and in spite of his relationships continued such. In what way do these relationships modify his fundamental character? Shakspeare, with unsentimental clarity, presents his character as complex. In like manner, in what way does Falstaff's not completely disinterested love for Prince Hal and his disregard for all serious considerations in life entitle him to immunity from the law of consequences? Or Malvolio's respectability compensate for his essential vulgarity and lack of a sense of humor? After all, Shakspeare is presenting these characters, not as it would be nice if they had been, in which case in the end all could be forgiven and forgotten, but as they *were*, observed by a kindly and tolerant but all-seeing and impartial creator who assumes no responsibility for their good behavior or their good fortune.

That, at least, is the effect—not the reality, of course. Shakspeare was seeking, as a writer for the stage, an effect, to be produced through the medium of the stage in accordance with the conventions of his day and of the stage. There has been a persistent conviction that he achieved that effect and that it was an effect of truth. In our critical discussions

we seem still to be entangled in that problem of predestination and free-will which Chaucer lets perplex the philosophizing of Chauntecleer in his earlier barnyard drama. Does the creator manipulate his characters for an effect of his own, or do they live their own lives? To insist on either view is to press a theory to an extreme and disregard that compromise which is the essence of art. We can, on the one hand, require the author to view his characters through our emotional reactions and sentimentality and insist that this or that is what this character would have done; or, on the other, we can deny to the characters any significance of their own beyond their use in establishing contrasting, that is to say, dramatic situations. Each process would involve the author in fundamental departures from artistic integrity hard to reconcile with the impression created by Shakspeare's plays of almost sharper actuality than experience itself.

If it is difficult to accept as probable the *psychology* of Shakspeare's characters as Dr. Stoll destructively analyzes it, it is even more difficult to imagine these characters in all their individual situations consistently exercising that calm, judicial rationality which Dr. Stoll would require of them if he were to consider them psychologically true. It would be hard to find in our dealings with our private friends, or in the chronicles of the daily press, or in the conduct of international affairs, that impeccable and unvarying rationality which Dr. Stoll sets up as the alternative to a drama of art and artifice concerned primarily with striking effect and dramatic contrast. We have plays which fall in this classification, plays in which consistency is sacrificed, but it is impossible to feel that the manipulated scene in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, or the theatrics of *The Maid's Tragedy*, or, to take a more modern example, the dramatic contrasts of Bulwer Lytton's *Richelieu*, really rank with the plays for which Shakspeare is remembered. Shakspeare's plays, by and large, romances and farces set aside, do produce such an effect of truth that critics still argue about the psychological lapses in the action of certain characters, much as we every day express surprise over the unexpected conduct of our personal acquaintances.

In the face of impressive and illuminating comparisons and analyses, which reveal his mastery of technique, Shakspeare still towers above his Jacobean contemporaries and more recent masters of artifice by the fact that his characters are, not like theirs, consistent only in scene, but produce *the effect of consistency* from the original assumption to the closing scene. This is an effect, of course. The characters are not in the round, but they seem so in comparison with slab-sided figures of less conscientious workers. The point I would make is, whether Shakspeare was concerned with psychology or not, and we certainly had psychology long before we had psychologists, he was concerned with the effect of truth, an effect to be secured legitimately by the use of such devices and conventions as belonged to his art, and an effect to be got on the stage through devices of the stage upon an audience. That he actually aimed at more than this at times, I think is apparent. That he sometimes achieved something less than the effect of truth is equally apparent, and in part intentional, where the material he was dealing with was too slight or too intractable to justify an effort not required by the total effect aimed at.

Shakspeare's unsentimental attitude toward his characters is, of course, conspicuous in his treatment of Cleopatra. The Seleucus episode in the period sometimes referred to as the "ennoblement" of Cleopatra, following her resolution to do it "after the high Roman fashion and make death proud to take her," exposes Cleopatra in a shabby lie about possessions concealed, with no evident purpose other than to keep a door open for herself if she should still decide to live. Shakspeare retained this episode from Plutarch and expanded it. If Shakspeare were concerned only with a great effect at the end, why should he here intrude this jarring episode? But Shakspeare does not fudge on fundamentals. Cleopatra could be magnificent; Cleopatra could be heroic; Cleopatra could be romantic; but Cleopatra could *not* be honest. As in the case of the rejection of Falstaff, and as in the case of the Jew of Venice, here too, when the temptation to sentimentalize is strong, Shakspeare sees more clearly than the critics.

Not that Shakspeare never yields to a popular weakness or never introduces a sentimental character; but when he does the one or the other, he does it knowingly and registers his own tolerant protest. In *As You Like It* Shakspeare capitulates to the demand for a happy ending by "laying it on with a trowel" and apologizing in Jaques' ironical remark about "the Noah's Ark procession" with which the play ends. If the absurdity of the ending had not been apparent to Shakspeare, he could hardly have made his character burlesque it in this phrase.

When Friar Laurence in *Romeo and Juliet* prepares to sum up in an inordinately long speech, Shakspeare makes him begin with the inevitable cliché of the long-winded speaker, "I will be brief," reminiscent of Chaucer's humorous designation of "The Tale of Melibeus" as "A Litel Thing in Prose," and of the nurse's yokel-like admiration after the friar's heavily conceited sermonizing:

Oh Lord, I could have stayed here all night
To hear good counsel! Oh, what learning is!

In both of these speeches and in Jaques' speech above, it seems apparent that Shakspeare felt he had done, or was about to do, something that called for justification, and he lets a character register a sort of apology through a remark which permits the reader or rather spectator to know that Shakspeare was conscious of the absurdity. That Shakspeare appreciated the fact when the joke was on himself with a clear-eyed amusement is amply apparent in that incident already alluded to in *The Winter's Tale*. Shakspeare, who had caused his father to appeal to the herald's college for a coat of arms, and attained the privilege of writing "Gentleman" after his name, could not have composed the dialogue between Autolycus and the clown without an inward chuckle:

Autolycus: I know you are now, Sir, a gentleman born.
Clown: Ay, and have been so any time these four hours.
Shepherd: So have I, boy.
Clown: So you have; but I was a gentleman born before my father; . . . and so we wept, and there was the first gentlemen-like tears that ever we shed.
Shepherd: We may live, son, to shed many more.

And is there not another instance of the poet with his tongue decorously in his cheek in *Hamlet*? Queen Gertrude is a superficial woman and on that count might be conceived of as uttering her pastoral elegy over the drowned Ophelia, but the passage insists on tearing itself out of the text. Here, to Laertes, elsewhere not noted for his patience, the Queen dallies with Ophelia's death in verses Shakspeare evidently enjoyed writing:

Queen: Your sister's drowned!

Laertes: Drowned! Oh, where?

Queen: There is a willow grows aslant a brook

Eighteen lines later Laertes exclaims, "Alas, then, is she drown'd?" I can not persuade myself that Shakspeare in thus making Laertes summarize the Queen with a kind of incredulous amazement, which could have been occasioned either by the tidings or the Queen's manner of arriving at them, could have been unaware of what amounts almost to a dramatic impropriety in the Queen's diffuse prettiness. Laertes' laconic rejoinder savors of the secret joke with which Shakspeare apologized to himself for being unable to throw away lines he had written, even though his characters found them difficult or surprising.

That Shakspeare should know when the joke was on himself is only a natural consequence of that clarity of vision, that lack of emotional distortion or sentimentality, which characterizes all of his work. Indeed, Shakspeare's assignment of a sense of humor to his characters is thoroughly illuminating. A glance over the personnel of his mimic world makes it obvious that it is more respectable to maintain a fool than a sense of humor, although infinitely more expensive, as witness King Lear. If Lear had had a sense of humor, he would have needed no fool; and there would have been no Heath scene and no tragedy. On the other hand, if Malvolio had had a sense of humor, there would have been no mad-house scene and no comedy. Shakspeare is lavish in his bestowal of a sense of humor upon clowns, fools, and women, gravediggers, Gobbo, Portia, and Rosalind. If one has too much of a sense of humor, he degenerates into a Falstaff; if too little, he stiffens into a Malvolio. The dif-

ference between the amount royalty may have, even in a premature state, and unroyal man, appears in the difference between Hal's burlesque enactment of the king, his father, in the Boar's Head tavern scene and that of the Falstaff. Hal is a better king, but Falstaff is humorous.

Shakspeare's lovers are rarely humorous; that is, the men are rarely humorous. Of course, there is Lorenzo, a subordinate figure, but for the most part Shakspeare's lovers are either sentimental or in the grip of powerful emotion. Shakspeare coupled lunatics and lovers. Barring Petruchio and Percy Hotspur, neither of whom would qualify as the typical lover, from Romeo to Antony, love has deranged the faculties of Shakspeare's heroes, a detail which would hardly deserve comment were it not for the fact that simultaneously Shakspeare's women become correspondingly more competent. If not lunatics, what cheerful idiots the comedy heroines make of their lovers. Portia taking the ring off Bassanio's hand and making him wish that he had cut his arm off first; Rosalind inveigling Orlando into rehearsing his love with the pretended swain; Viola, if not consciously bedeviling the sentimental duke, at least making him come to heel in the end. Romeo can jump over the garden wall and apostrophize Juliet's eyes, but it is Juliet who says, "What time tomorrow shall we be married?" As for Antony and Cleopatra, the relationship is summarized in the episode Shakspeare retains from Plutarch, at least in reference, in which Antony thinks to impress Cleopatra by his success in fishing, employing slaves to dive beneath and fasten fish upon his hook. Cleopatra, in no way taken in by the fraud, sends down her own slave to fasten on Antony's hook a dried herring, which he pulls up, to the infinite diversion of all concerned. There you have the posturing, self-centered lover and the clear-visioned, perfectly poised woman. Shakspeare's women, laughingly or in deadly earnest, go clear-sightedly and undeterred by conventions or scruples to their object. Not only the Rosalinds and the Violas, but also the Lady Macbeths. One would like to have known Macbeth with all his imaginative power as he must have been when wooing his subsequent lady. But what Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra did to their men is, quite needless to observe, outside the field of humor. Shakspeare

dowers his women with his own clarity of vision undeflected by emotion. Beatrice is the only one who sees the innocence of Hero.

If Shakspeare's treatment of the lover illustrates his unsentimental clarity of vision, his treatment of the lunatic is still more revealing. To compare King Lear with the hero of Tennyson's "Maud" is by a stroke to illuminate the difference that Ruskin envisaged between the poets of the first order and those of the second in his footnote to the famous Chapter on the "Pathetic Fallacy" in *Modern Painters*. Shakspeare introduces sentimental figures among his characters. Romeo and Orsino are both sentimental at the beginning of the play and both for the sufficient reason that Shakspeare wants them in a mood rapidly to transfer their affection to some other object later in the play. Jaques is sentimental. Shakspeare goes out of his way to invent a past for him in order that his sentimental cynicism may be intelligible. He and the pastoral lovers form the proper foil for the burlesque of Touchstone and Audrey. Shakspeare creates sentimental figures but he sees them for what they are and derives his comedy from laughing at them. Tennyson creates a sentimental figure with whom we are asked to sympathize. He invests him with madness which is tragic for the hero but only pathological to the reader. We feel an *identity* of sympathy between the poet and the hero which would have been impossible to Shakspeare with such a character. There is no softness toward self-pity in Shakspeare, no sentimentality in the poet. On the other hand, in Tennyson there is no objective criticism implied, no secret joke, like those detached ironies I have attempted to point out in Shakspeare. "What matter if I go mad?" cries the hero in "Maud," and the reader echoes, "What matter?"

Theseus observed of the lunatic, the lover and the poet that they were "of imagination all compact." The purpose of this discussion has been to illustrate one quality of that imagination, as Shakspeare exercised it, the unsentimental clarity of vision with which he viewed his characters, and apparently, himself.

*Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon.*

IMAGES IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE* DRAWN FROM FLORA AND FAUNA

By GRACE WARREN LANDRUM

SPENSER'S years on earth, generally calculated at forty-seven or thereabouts, afforded him an unusually wide acquaintance with rural life, despite his boyhood in the "walled town." Yet readers, thinking of him as singularly literary, a vigorous Eumnestes, "tossing and turning" books endlessly without the page Anamnestes, credit him with only a second-hand acquaintance with the earth beneath his feet, granting him, of course, the high-bred Elizabethan's conventional knowledge of gardening, horsemanship, essential to "vertuous and gentle discipline." That Spenser utilized genuine observation in drawing imagery from the vegetable and animal life of his native and his adopted isle is the thesis of this brief study.¹ It attempts only æsthetic appreciation. It offers no new obligations to sources. It refers to gleanings in the Spenser *Variorum* only when emphasis seems necessary.²

Elton's essay, "Colour and Imagery in Spenser," in his *Modern Studies*, is still illuminating, though all too brief.³ My study is only incidentally an examination of Spenser's ontology, Lucretian or otherwise. The starting point taken is only his general conception of nature, particularly as set forth in the splendid scene in *Mutability*, Canto VII, the contest of Mutability and Nature. Nature triumphs and the last stanza of the poem prophesies the end of change:

" . . . no more Change shall be,
But stedfast rest of all things firmly stayd
Upon the pillours of Eternity,
That is contrayr to Mutabilitie:
For, all that moueth, doth in Change delight-
But thence-forth all shall rest eternally
With him that is the God of Sabbaoth hight".

C. E. Lewis puts it thus: "Most commonly he [Spenser] understands nature as Aristotle did, the nature of everything brings its unimpeded growth from within to perfection, neither checked by accident nor sophisticated by art

... In some respects he symbolizes God himself."⁴ Evans parallels the idea, saying that to Spenser "God is God in virtue of his infinite stability."⁵ Nevertheless, Spenser has various conceptions of the powers of nature. The Garden of Adonis⁶ is the handwork of "dame nature," scene of perpetually renewed milennial cycles of flora and fauna, whose

"substance is not chaunged, nor altered
But th' only forme and outward fashion".⁷

There is a somewhat confused conception of "naked babes," clad and unclad with immortality, of ever renewed "infinite creatures," familiar and strange, the substances of "natures fruitful progenyes" supplied from the "huge eternal chaos" in the "wide womb of the world"—confused since, despite all this, Time is ever stalking in the garden. Venus, here, as once elsewhere, is the "root of all that joyous is,"⁸ a "great mother," and so a variant of nature, who grieves to see "so faire things mard and spoyled quight," but finds "redress for such despight" because "all things decay in time, and to their end do draw."⁹ Yet her sergeant is Order,¹⁰ and she, though subject to decay, not extinction, is not red in tooth and claw, but still "a great mother of us all,"¹¹ our "mother earth," even "Grandmother magnifide."¹² As the great goddess, arrayed against Mutability, she is so terrible in her bright beauty that her face must be veiled, her sex thus concealed, her garments being as dazzling as those of the Three on the Mount of Transfiguration.¹³

To nature as a generatrix are assigned, conventionally enough, the functions of Earth in the Meredithian sense. Her womb, her fruitful breast, whence "welheads spring," "with moisture dewed," her bounteous lodging "to all creatures"¹⁴ suggests also the earth of Wordsworth. From her "secret works" one wise-hearted, like Canace, could learn the "power of herbes, and tunes of beasts and burds." Nature commands the seasons and the months, Day, Night, the Hours, "Death with grim and griesly visage," Life, "the faire young lusty boy," as the long procession unfolds before Jove as umpire in the Nature and Mutability contest.¹⁵

We can well imagine that Spenser and Harvey, enthralled by speculations on the earthquake of April, 1580, would have delighted in modern geology. For them the science had progressed no further than the classic conceptions of the Ages of Metals.¹⁶ Spenser hardly excels in dealing with grand configurations of the earth, for he is often content with generalizations of mountains, hills, plains, "ploughed ridge," but physical geography is a very personal affair, most of all when storms at sea or the mountains and the streams of Kilcolman are concerned. He is sensitive to effects of mire, muck, to the coldness of the earth, which is also bare and hard, and thus personifies it with excellent effect:

'The sad earth wounded with so sore array
Did grone full greivous underneath the blow
And trembling with strange feare, did like an earthquake show.'¹⁷

Nevertheless, the fixedness and the resistance of the rocks rather than the stirring of earth or sand arrest him. Arthur's terrific assault on Gerioneo seemed dreadful enough to rive "a marble rock asunder." In a delicate simile, suggesting a boy's remembered pastime, the blow of Sir Sanglier against Talus moved him no more

"than when a rocke
Is lightly stricken by some stones thrown."¹⁸

Rocks are often personified. They are "towering to reach the sky." They can scarcely refrain from tears in response to the "piteous mone" of Marinell's mother.¹⁹ The sight of wounded Timias is heavy enough to "have made a rock of stone to rew."²⁰ Besides the "stony heart," "heart of flint," Spenser gives us more individually (and much oftener than Shakspeare) "stony eyes," "stony cold," "stony horror," "stony fears," and "stony mind."

The conception of seed time and harvest evoked numerous figures, especially those dealing with seed (practically fifty), with stock and root. The victims of Talus

"lay scattered over all the land
As thick as doth the seede after the sowers hand."

Seeds may be "fruitless" or "ill grounded." *Seed* for heavenly or human origin is naturally common: "Of im-

mortal seed," "vulgar and the noble seed," "Day's children be the blessed seed." "Seeds of discord" serve for Ate as bread.²¹ She sows "seeds of evil words and factious deeds." "Seeds of vice" have "cropt the branches of the sient base." Again, the "root of all honour and virtue is love." The "stock of passion is withered and dry." Though the list could be extended considerably, the figures are too conventional even to be catalogued. Descriptive enough for isolation are "the unploughed furrow," applied to literary narrative (doubtless an imitation of his master's "large feld to ere"), the rout fleeing from the blows of Talus like "scattered chaff," and Malbecco "withered like hay." A powerful simile is based on the likeness of Satyrane's overthrow of the monster pursuing Florimel to the loss of a harvest through flood:

"As he that striues to stop a suddein flood,
And in strong banckes his violence enclose,
Forceth it swell aboue his wonted mood,
And largely ouerflow the fruitfull plaine,
That all the countrey seemes to be a Maine
And the rich furrowes flote, all quite fordonne.
The wofull husbandman doth lowd complaine,
To see his whole yeares labour lost so soone,
For which to God he made so many an idle boone"²²

(Ruthless as Spenser may appear in his *Veue*, was there any shattering of human hope with which he did not sympathize?)

An Elizabethan saw three-fourths of his native isle forested. Small wonder that trees figure largely in Spenser. Granted that either Boccaccio or Chaucer could have suggested the list in the Wood of Error, Henley, an authority on Spenser's Irish locale, believes that the Wood of Glengageenty may have been a first-hand source, perhaps an addition to Book I. All the trees in the catalogue, except the myrrh and the olive, she believes could have been seen in his adopted island.²³ We may grant that Ariosto is superior in the specific mention of ilex, oak, mountain ash, flowering thorn, in delicacy of detail as to eddying and scattered leaves in water, but Spenser is more than bookishly conventional. He bases a figure on the trembling aspen;²⁴

by the low drooping willow he symbolizes inferiority.²⁵ Duessa's withered skin is like "maple rind." Rude peasants flock against Artegall as flies swarm on a "birchen bough." A root upturned by a "Salvage" is shaken like "a hazel wand."²⁶ Oaks could hardly have escaped him, but he sees them pictorially, garland-wise around the source of Molanna.²⁷ Against the colorless figures from fruit, the "timely fruit of love," "fruit of joye and blisse," fruit in May, and terms relating perhaps to vine or bush as well as tree,²⁸ we may set grapes lurking amid leaves,²⁹ "greene-apples and red Cherries,"³⁰ the withered apple tree blossoming again through "husband's toile."³¹ Numerous similes concern withered and fallen trees. Ate is like a withered tree,³² Orgoglio's fall is like that of

"an aged tree
High growing on the top of rocky clift,
Whose heartstrings with keene steele nigh hewen be,
The mightie trunk halfe rent, with ragged rift
Doth roll adowne the rocks, and fall with fearefull drift"³³

To rotten wood he compares the riven mail of Cambell and Diamond.³⁴ Duessa in her specious beauty is "the withered tree that wanted juice."³⁵ Dry wood is the symbol of combustible passion.³⁶ The fallen tree symbolizes death.³⁷

Bough, branch, leaf suggest figures too similar to war-rant discrimination: "Budding branches," "branches of nobleness," fruitless branches, "boughs of vice." On the favorite Elizabethan figure of grafting he bases the idea of the pain of love. Springtime burgeoning³⁸ and pruning may not be distinctly noted, but he shows variety in observation of fallen leaves. They symbolize the languishing of love, prostrate forms beneath assailants' blows, the pierced and wasting body; dis severed, bloody locks.

Trees, purely literary to Spenser, are the olives "on the sacred hill"³⁹ and, doubtless, the almond

"ymounted hye
On top of greene Selinis all alone,
With blossomes braue bedecked daintily,
Whose tender locks do tremble euery one
At euery little breath that vnder heauen is blowne"⁴⁰

(Incidentally, the description is apt enough for actual observation.)

The episode of the talking trees in Book I has been marked as more restrained than the parallel in Ariosto.⁴¹ The Biblical concept of the Tree of Life needs no comment. The healing value Percival believes to be based also on an idea in *Bevis of Hampton*.⁴²

In the April Eclogue of the *Shepherdes Calender* Spenser's delight in a dozen varieties of flowers proves that he knew 'the daedale earth.' His content with generalizations in the *Faerie Queene* is therefore surprisingly accounted for, perhaps, by a growing passion for allegorization. Thus his favorite metaphor for youth is "flower of tender years," "of freshest youth," "first ages flower," to mention only a few expressions of a redundant idea. Various excellencies are represented by flowers,—virtue, chastity, grace, nobleness, courtesy, honour. Beauty, fame, chivalry, pride, are likewise compared. Human figures are included: the Argonauts (flower of Greece), Helen of Troy, and necessarily (yet sincerely, as we may infer from E. C. Wilson's illuminating *England's Eliza*), Gloriana, that "goodly, gracious flower." Other heroines as flowers of chastity and beauty are Una, Britomart, Belphebe, Florimel, Canace. Duessa's false beauty is flowerlike. Though he mentions the "dread sleeping poppy" and the "flourdelice," the specific figures in metaphor are only the commonest in Elizabethan imagery, the red rose and the lily. Belphebe is the rose of heaven; Canace, fresh as morning rose. Yet the similes, some from classic or Italian sources, the most charming of all, the "virgin rose" passage from the *Gerusalemme Liberata*,⁴³ are pleasing indeed. Though an odd fancy depicts the mole on the infant Claribel's "little brest of christall bright" as a rose unfolding with silken leaves,⁴⁴ the rose less concretely symbolizes love and reviving hope. The fearsome beauty of Britomart is more definitely described in an exquisite, miniature *Roman de la Rose*:

"For she was full of amiable grace,
And manly terrour mixed therewithall,

That as the one who stird vp affections bace,
 So th'other did mens rash desires apall,
 And hold them backe, that would in errour fall;
 As he, that hath espide a vermeill Rose,
 To which sharpe thornes and breres the way forstall
 Dare not for dread his hardy hand expose,
 But wishing it far off, his idle wish doth lose."⁴⁵

As usual, roses and lilies combine in the stock figure of the lady's cheek. To the lily the hand is compared with the tedious insistence of the period. The bodies of the naked maidens dancing around Pastorella are "lilly white." Garments are white as lilies. Drops of "purple blood" stain the lily smock.⁴⁶ Symbolically Una is all "lilly white, withouten spot or pride."

Spenser has several figures from garlands. One of these, which chances to be of a rosy wreath, is a metaphor for Belphebe's honour.⁴⁷ Silence and obedience are the garlands of God's saints.⁴⁸ Helen of Troy is the "garland of mighty conquerors." Nymphs surround Diana like a garland. Comely virgins with "garlands dight" are themselves

"As fresh as flowers in meadow greene do grow,"

an expression called Botticellian.⁴⁹

That the grass withereth, the flower "so fresh at morne" fadeth "at evening late," Spenser notes frequently. Pastorella's beauty fades like a flower. Red Cross's flesh shrinks like withered flowers. Time wastes "the flowering herbes" with his flaggie wings. "Gather ye rosebuds while ye may" Spenser thus expresses:

"So passeth, in the passing of a day,
 Of mortall life the leafe, the bud, the flowre,
 Ne more doth flourish after first decay,
 That earst was sought to decke both bed and bowre,
 Of many a Ladie, and many a Paramowre:
 Gather therefore the Rose, whilst yet is prime,
 For soone comes age, that will her pride deflowre:
 Gather the Rose of loue, whilst yet is time,
 Whilst louing thou mayst loued be with equall crime."⁵⁰

The Squire's hopeless love for Belphebe is a "blossom blasted through heat and decay." With the decay of flowers

may be likened the unfavorable comparisons drawn from weeds and thorns. Jealousy is a weed. Bad ladies among good are "weeds among roses." Lust is deflowering. Thorns prick the jealous heart. Victims are trodden down like docks. No picture of decaying vegetation in Spenser is so powerful as Shakspeare's

"Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds,"

though he excels in describing noisomeness from other causes.

If Spenser as a specialist in floriculture is not notable (yet equal to other Elizabethans, Shakspeare excepted), he deserves more gracious comment than this:

"Spenser's eye for visible nature was so little focussed that for vegetation he has only the adjective 'green,' 'pallid green,' and 'pallid,' for the ocean no realistic hues, for mountains none except 'green'."⁵¹

Granted that in Ireland Spenser in trim gardens took his leisure less frequently than in the rich cultivation of London, Cambridge, or "the glen" of the "widow's daughter," and focussed on the wilder beauty of his Arlo and Mole, the lush streams of the valleys near Kilcoleman, he increased proportionately his knowledge of animal life.⁵² We may progress from the familiar to the unfamiliar, to the strange and, lastly, to the highly fantastic or monstrous creatures.⁵³ Previous studies of Spenser have marked his skill in animal life. Well aware of these comments, the investigator may yet find Spenser's figures based on animal life even astonishingly numerous and varied.

Spenser delights in the figurative use of wings, these sometimes purely conventional as the "winged wind," "winged thought," "golden wings" of love. Reminiscent of Chaucer is:

"For soone as maestrie comes, great love anone
Taket hys nimble wings, and soone away is goone."⁵⁵

"Fear gave her wings"⁵⁶ is varied with "wings of feare like

fowle aghast,"⁵⁷ "wings of speedy feare,"⁵⁸ "wings of idle feare."⁵⁹ Horror has "iron wings."⁶⁰ Pastorella's rearing is under the "base Shepherdes wings."⁶¹ The darkness of Eventyde shelters under "brod black wings."⁶² Praise of Spenser's treatment of winged insects abounds.⁶³ The simile of the shepherd brushing away "with clownish hands" the tender wings of gnats combines touch, sound, physical discomfort in remarkable realism.⁶⁴ With equal effect Spenser describes the "swarms of gnats at eventide" in the "fennes of Allan."⁶⁵ Around Calidore swarm thieves as

"many flyes in th'hottest summers day
Do seize upon some beast, whose flesh is bare,
That all the place with swarms do overlay
And with their little stings right fully fare"⁶⁶

Talus overcomes assailants as if they were a "swarm of flies."⁶⁷ The crowd around Serena awakening is "like many flies." Archimago calls forth legions of spirits "like little flies."⁶⁸ The Giant with the Balance attracts the vulgar like "foolish flyes about an honey crocke."⁶⁹ The followers of Radigund swarm around her like bees.⁷⁰ Spenser achieves a magical effect in the famous Cave of Morpheus passage, the

"ever drizzling raine upon the loft
Mixt with the murmuring winde, much like the sowne
Of swarming Bees"

Imagination's chamber

"filled was with flies
Which buzzed all about, and made such sound
That they encombered all mens eares and eyes
Like many swarms of Bees assembled round,
After their hives with honny do abound;
All those were idle thoughts and fantasies,
Devices, dreams, opinions unsound,
Shewes, visions, sooth-sayers and prophecies,
And all that fained is, as leasings, tales, and lies.

(Spenser was here doubtless recalling the *House of Fame*, Book III, ll. 861-886.)

Spenser notes also the insidious destruction by insects, the "hidden moth," that frets "the inner garment."⁷¹ The

cankerworm to Spenser symbolizes devouring Time and Age, ruinous to the poet's effort.⁷²

Horses, which Spenser prefers to call 'steeds,' are mentioned constantly. Yet none has a place among the great horses of romance and history. None is so superbly realistic as Shakspeare's in *Venus and Adonis*; none is so "horsely," to quote Chaucer's delightful term. But all Elizabethans whose journeys exceeded those from the blue bed to the brown were by necessity riders. Spenser, though a sizar, doubtless always rode the some sixty miles from London to Cambridge, since, as his stipend had been granted to him "ægrotanti," he was scarcely a robust pedestrian. In several capacities in Ireland he must have ridden constantly, perhaps daily. We may thus predicate actual as well as literary experience for his knowledge of mounts.

The most famous of these, Una's palfrey, is of course of literary provenience. Had the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem been made on any other beast of burden, we should have missed the second glorification in literature of the humble ass. That Spenser does not always think of the ass as thus exalted we know from the beast ridden by Idleness in the procession leading to the House of Pride. He has also some generalized conceptions of mounts. An old horse is "hard to teach to amble true."⁷³ The horse of the "cruell Sarazin" at the bridge could swim "like to a fish."⁷⁴ The pride of ages succeeding the perfect "antique world" is like that of "corn-fed steeds." A steed is "stubborn," "firie mouthed"; the hungry steed abstains with difficulty from "pleasant lare." Metaphors are derived from the equipment of a horse: the bridle is needed for the "wanton will," or for the affections, and Blandamour is called a "hot-spurre youth."⁷⁵

If Spenser has done little to individualize horses, we should expect even less in his treatment of dogs, perhaps no greater regard for them than Shakspeare had. On the whole, Spenser, if less detailed than Shakspeare in his "valued file" in *Macbeth*, is rather more favorable in his numerous similes.⁷⁶ Dogs are usually ferocious, "hungry dogs

eager for carrion." Mastiffs typify the fury of Gerioneo.⁷⁷ Angry knights are mastiffs unrestrainable against the powerless Britomart.⁷⁸ A long simile likens her fruitless attempt to stop a conflict to that of subduing a mastiff already fleshed.⁷⁹ The conflict of Blandamour and Paridell is like that of mastiffs in conflict;⁸⁰ the struggle of the gentle Squire with Disdain resembles that of a mastiff having at bay "a salvage bull." The railing of Slander resembles the biting and tearing of curs.⁸¹ Pyrocles is reviled as by a

"Shepherd curre, that in dark evenings shade
Hath tracted forth some salvage beastes trade."⁸²

Spenser views a dog more favorably when he sees the watchful shepherd dog descry a wolf in the flock,⁸³ and he certainly has an especial eye for spaniels.⁸⁴ The distress of Florimel is like that of a hungry spaniel escaping from one danger to another.⁸⁵ Sanglier's unwillingness to take up the head of a dead lady is like that of a "rated spaniel," which "takes his burden up with feare."⁸⁶ Some of the stock disparagement of dogs, as old as Homer and the Hebrew Scriptures (for instance, "thrust like a dog out of doors") may be offset by the simile of Talus at the door of Britomart:

"Like to a Spaniell wayting carefully
Least any should betray his Lady treacherously"⁸⁷

If we miss Ariosto's Homeric pleasure in a dog rejoicing at the return of his master, Spenser has only one mention of the fawning dog,⁸⁸ so repellent to Shakspeare.⁸⁹

Heise has commented on the increase in dog similes after Book I.⁹⁰ He cites many literary precedents, classic and Italian, as basic for Spenser's concern with hunting and sporting dogs. His great interest in falconry other critics have noted freely.⁹¹ Horse, hawk, and hound are so treated in figures drawn from hunting that it is difficult to categorize. It seems advisable to refer to game of rarer mention, "the light-foot hare,"⁹² the knights in conflict with Talus that "all about the fields like Squirrils hunt,"⁹³ and to treat hawking only generally, in an attempt to see basic figures, if possible, and Spenser's own interest in the sport.⁹⁴ He likens Malengin to the fowler, charming birds with "guile-

ful pype."⁸⁵ Omitting certain striking similes of pursuit that may occur easily to the reader, I shall mention certain typical birds of prey and their victims, all of which have figurative values: falcon and ducks and heronshaw; goshawke and culver; kite after puttocks; eagle pursuing heron; goshawk and bittern; the raven sending forth his destructive brood; vultures striking at a heron; a dove fleeing from a "tassel gent." Spenser varies his sympathy, now with the captor, then with the captive, especially with the latter, as when Florimel escapes from the fisher like a partridge from a hawk.⁸⁶ A simile, stanza-long, describes a bird regaining courage after fright by a hawk.⁸⁷ He mentions bell and jesses, but with no suggestion of the utterly poignant figure in *Othello*. One fancies him often as an observer as well as a participant. Pictures at long range are among the most powerful in all the *Faerie Queene*.

[To be concluded]

¹Figures involving the atmosphere and water are omitted. See G. W. Landrum, "Spenser's Clouded Heaven," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, Vol. XI, No. 3. (July, 1936), and a forthcoming article "Images of Water in the *Faerie Queene*," *English Literary History*.

²All references to comments in *The Works of Edmund Spenser, a Variorum Edition*, Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, are listed as *Variorum*, etc. The line-by-line references are to the *Oxford Spenser*.

³See Florence Eckert, "The Portrayal of Nature in Spenser," unpublished M.A. dissertation at the University of Chicago, 1912, for a classification of numerous figures portraying nature. See also W. Heise *Die Gleichnisse in Edmund Spenser's 'Faerie Queene' und ihre Vorbilder*, Königssee, 1902.

⁴*Variorum*, VI, VII, 281

⁵Quoted by H. S. V. Jones, *A Spenser Handbook* (1930), p. 307

⁶*FQ*, III, 6, 29ff.

⁷*Ibid.*, III, 6, 38, 1-2.

⁸*Ibid.*, IV, 10, 47, 6. See *Variorum* IV, 236, for Lotspeich's attribution to *Natalis Comes*.

⁹*Ibid.*, III, 6, 40.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 4, 6

¹¹*Ibid.*, II, 1, 10, 6

¹²*Ibid.*, VII, 6, 26, 5

¹³*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 7, 3-9

¹⁴*Ibid.*, V, 10, 24, 6

¹⁵*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 27-47

¹⁶See *Variorum*, V, 154, for comments by Legovis.

¹⁷*FQ*, I, 8, 8, 7-9

¹⁸*Ibid.*, V, 1, 21, 6-7

¹⁹*Ibid.*, III, 4, 35, 7

²⁰*Ibid.*, III, 5, 30, 2

²¹*Ibid.*, IV, 1, 26, 1

²²*Ibid.*, III, 7, 34

²³Pauline Henley, *Spenser in Ireland*, p. 128

²⁴*FQ*, I, 9, 51, 3-4.

²⁵*Ibid.*, IV, 1, 47, 9

²⁶*Ibid.*, VI, 7, 24, 9.

²⁷*Ibid.*, VII, 6, 41, 2-3

²⁸See *Variorum* II, 217, and compare *FQ* 11, 12, 54 for the gem-like fruit in the Bower of Bliss.

²⁹*FQ*, 11, 12, 54, 3-4

³⁰*Ibid.*, VII, 6, 43, 6

³¹*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 29, 5-9.

³²*Ibid.*, IV, 1, 31, 5-6.

³³*Ibid.*, I, 8, 22, 6-9. See *Variorum* I, 259, for classic and Italian sources and IV, 183 for Heise's comment on the oak, "especially when old", as Spenser's favorite or most frequently mentioned tree.

³⁴*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 15, 5-6 ³⁵*Ibid.*, III, 8, 25, 5 ³⁶*Ibid.*, III, 8, 25, 5

³⁷*Ibid.*, I, 10, 41, 9 ³⁸*Ibid.*, IV, 12, 34, 6-9 ³⁹*Variorum* I, 252

⁴⁰*FQ*, I, 7, 32, 5-9.

⁴¹John Hoole, *Work of the English Poets and the Most Approved Translations*, Vol. XXI, *Ariosto and Tasso* (London, 1810). See also *Variorum* I, 202-3, for Hughes' comment and Greenlaw's admiration of the Virgilian adaptation.

⁴²*Variorum* I, 301 ⁴³*Ibid.*, I, 388 ⁴⁴*FQ*, VI, 12, 7, 8-9.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, III, 1, 46, 6 ⁴⁶*Variorum* III, 213 ⁴⁷*FQ*, III, 5, 51, 3

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, IV, 10, 51, 9 ⁴⁹*Variorum* I, 224

⁵⁰*FQ* II, 12, 75 Upton credits to Tasso (*Variorum* II, 388).

⁵¹A. E. Pratt, quoted by Fletcher, *Variorum* II, 216. For Spenser's nicety in treating effects of water see G. W. Landrum's article referred to in Note 1 *supra*.

⁵²Some of the material on this topic overlaps that of domestic life in Spenser reserved for a later paper. Differentiation is necessarily difficult.

⁵³*Orlando Furioso* afforded Spenser wide range. ox, bull, horse, deer, goat, lamb, iam, sparrow-hawk and other birds of prey, dog, cat, mouse, moth, leopard, and the famous roc may be mentioned.

⁵⁴B. E. C. Davis, *Edmund Spenser*, Cambridge University Press, 1933, p. 174, Oliver Elton, "Colour and Imagery in Spenser", *Modern Studies* (London, 1907), pp. 73-76.

⁵⁵*FQ* III, 1, 25, 8-9 ⁵⁶*Ibid.*, I, 4, 32, 1 ⁵⁷*Ibid.*, V, 8, 4, 8

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, V, 8, 4, 8 ⁵⁹*Ibid.*, III, 5, 6, 6 ⁶⁰*Ibid.*, III, 6, 54, 9

⁶¹*Ibid.* II, 7, 23, 1-2 ⁶²*Ibid.*, VI, 9, 35, 4. ⁶³*Ibid.*, VI, 8, 44, 4-5.

⁶⁴See *Variorum* I, 187-8 for comments by Upton, Greenlaw, Winstanley, Nicholson, Elton (*op. cit.*, p. 74).

⁶⁵*FQ*, I, 1, 23

⁶⁶See Pauline Henley, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-9, and Kitchen, *Variorum* I, 285.

⁶⁷*FQ* VI, 11, 48, 1-4. See B. E. C. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 171, for comment on Spenser as the "gentleman farmer."

⁶⁸*FQ*, V, 2, 53, 5 ⁶⁹*Ibid.*, I, 1, 38, 2 ⁷⁰*Ibid.*, V, 2, 33, 1-3

⁷¹*Ibid.*, V, 4, 36, 7-8, *Variorum* V, 199.

⁷²*FQ* II, 2, 34, 7-8, *Variorum* II, 200. The editor says there is no authority for the Prayer Book reading. The phrase comes not from the Prayer Book but from Cranmer's Bible. See G. W. Landrum, "Spenser's Use of the Bible," *PMLA*, Vol. 41, 1926, p. 522.

⁷³*FQ* IV, 2, 33, 6 ⁷⁴*Ibid.*, III, 8, 26, 3 ⁷⁵*Ibid.*, V, 2, 13, 9

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, IV, 1, 35, 5.

A striking conception of horses occurs in the description of the Chariot of Night. See G. W. Landrum, "Spenser's *Clouded Heaven*," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 147. See *Variorum* II, 274, for Upton's comment on the mention of a "tomb-black" steed as Homeric. But the particular epithet is Spenser's own.

⁷⁷Heise has counted twenty-eight dog similes. *Variorum* V, 232. (See editor's praise of Spenser's vigor.) B. E. C. Davis, (*op. cit.*, pp. 174-5.) surmises that the "landowner in a hostile country must certainly have known the value of dogs."

⁷⁸*FQ*, V, 11, 12, 1-2. ⁷⁹*Ibid.*, IV, 9, 31, 5-9 ⁸⁰*Ibid.*, IV, 9, 31, 2-9.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, IV, 2, 17, 8. ⁸²*Ibid.*, IV, 8, 36, 5-9 ⁸³*Ibid.*, II, 6, 39, 3-4

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, V, 12, 38, 5-6. ⁸⁵*Cf. Variorum*, III, 271 ⁸⁶*FQ*, III, 8, 33, 6-7.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, V, 1, 29, 9 ⁸⁸*Ibid.*, V, 6, 26, 8-9 ⁸⁹*Ibid.*, VI, 4, 11, 2

⁹⁰C. E. F. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery*, p. 197.

⁹¹*Variorum*, V, 232.

⁹²Upton, *Variorum*, I, 298, Warton, III, 286; Dodge, VI-VII, 203; Davis, *op. cit.*, 175; Henley, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁹³*FQ* III, 4, 46, 4-5, *Variorum* III, 243.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, V, 11, 59, 3

⁹⁵Henley (*op. cit.*, p. 196) note eight varieties of hawks in Ireland called goshawks

⁹⁶*FQ*, V, 9, 13, 1 ⁹⁷*Ibid.*, III, 8, 33, 3. ⁹⁸*Ibid.*, II, 3, 36

PERFORMANCES OF SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS AT MARGARET RUTH

| PLAYS | 1765 | | 1766 | | 1767 | | 1768 | | 1769 | |
|-------------------------------------|------|----|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|
| | G | L | G | L | G | L | G | L | G | L |
| | C | D | C | D | C | D | C | D | C | D |
| All's Well That Ends Well | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| As You Like It | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | 1 | |
| Comedy of Errors | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coriolanus | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Cymbeline | | 4 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Hamlet | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| Julius Caesar | | | 4 | | 1 | | | | | |
| King Henry IV | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| King Henry V. | | | 8 | | 3 | | 2 | | | |
| King Henry VIII. | | | | | | | | | | |
| King John | | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | | |
| King Lear | 5 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | |
| Macbeth | 2 | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Measure for Measure | | | | | | | | | | |
| Merchant of Venice | 1 | | | | 8 | | 6 | 5 | | 6 |
| Merry Wives of Windsor | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | 1 | | 2 |
| Much Ado About Nothing | | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Othello | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 2 | | 3 |
| Richard III. | 4 | 4 | 9 | | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Romeo and Juliet | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| The Tempest | | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | 6 |
| Timon of Athens | | | | | | | | | | |
| Twelfth Night | | | | | | | | | | |
| A Winters Tale | | 2 | | | | | | | | |

¹As announced in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, except for June, 1768-January, 1769, which period

RAW MATERIALS FOR A SHAKSPERE BIOGRAPHY

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

SOME of our readers will undoubtedly recall that we have more than once in these pages referred to Professor Roland B. Lewis's long-delayed work on Shakspeare. We are happy to say that at last the books—two handsomely printed and beautifully cloth-bound folio volumes, weighing about thirteen pounds (1) and measuring approximately $14\frac{1}{2}$ x $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches—are being distributed to the subscribers. The publisher is the Stanford University Press, located in Stanford University, California. The edition is limited to 850 sets, each selling for \$35 after June 1st (\$25 before that date). One of the most important features of these volumes, entitled *The Shakespeare Documents*, is the facsimiles, of which there are fifty-nine, 5 larger than two pages (21" x 20", 18" x 20", etc., requiring a double fold), 6 double-page spreads, 38 single-page size, and 10 smaller ones. Both the author and the publisher assure us that every effort has been made to make the facsimiles of these documents as faithful and as useful reproductions of the originals as they could: "every technical art has been utilized to screen off ink-blotches, grease-spots, mould-spots, wine-slops, crushed-vermin spots, etc., so as to bring the hidden handwriting to light." About nineteen years ago, Dr. Lewis tells us, he conceived the idea of preparing a book in which all the important early documents bearing upon Shakspeare's life would be faithfully reproduced, scrupulously transcribed ('transliterated' *in extenso*), accurately translated and fully elucidated with editorial commentary. He realized that for this task he had to acquaint himself with all the intricacies of the law Latin in which many of these documents are written, to qualify himself as an "expert in Elizabethan palæography" (inasmuch as Halliwell-Phillipps was not so qualified—see page vii), and to make his own and, as far as possible, "original" and "independent" transcripts (Halliwell-Phillipps had not done so). Dr. Lewis and his publisher think that he has not only succeeded in performing what he set out to do but

that he has done so with "scholarly accuracy . . . throughout."

Undeniably, there is much in these heavy volumes which is of value. A number of Dr. Lewis's discussions (*e.g.*, the Shakspeare-Hathaway marriage, the application for a coat-of arms, and the poet's will) add considerably to our knowledge regarding the history and customs associated with the matters treated; that they add to our knowledge of the poet may safely be denied. The attempt to whitewash Shakspeare in the Whately-Hathaway tangle is more than unconvincing. The interpretation of the will as a document calculated to prove that "the dramatist desired to establish his family and his estate in the descent of the male line of landed gentry" (page 506) may, in view of the fact that Shakspeare had no son living in 1616, be dismissed as one of Dr. Lewis's fixed ideas. The discussion of the squabbles in the College of Arms is pertinent and valuable, especially as it is accompanied with the publication of considerable material from the Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library, which has hitherto not been generally accessible.

Shakspeare scholarship is sorely in need of a book somewhat along the lines intended by Dr. Lewis. An inexpensive book containing reliable and readable facsimiles—in collocation!—of every extant document dealing with the poet and his family (from about 1500 to about 1650) and scrupulously accurate transcripts and faithful translations would be a godsend. Such a book ought to be free from any editorial commentary. D. H. Lambert's book (*Shakespeare Documents*, 1904) was a laudable attempt in this direction, but it had very few facsimiles (reduced and in halftone), the transcripts were often inaccurate, Latin documents were not translated and it is now many important years behind the times. Dr. Pierce Butler's *Materials for the Life of Shakespeare* (published in 1930) is an excellent *précis*, even though it is not free from commentary, but it lacks facsimiles. If Professor Tucker Brooke's *Shakespeare of Stratford* (published in 1926) had included the records of William Shakspeare's parents and grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins, and facsimiles of the documents, it would have been the ideal Shakspeare biography. Of course, no book dealing with Shakspeare's life and no Shaksperian scholar

can dispense with Halliwell-Phillipps' *Life* and *Outlines*, even though they are far from being up-to-date. Even Dr. Lewis has leaned heavily on him. But the specialist who wants access to all the documentary material pertaining to Shakspeare, if he is not too particular about accuracy in verbal transcripts (which, after all, are rarely of any importance) and about style, will find them in Edmund K. Chambers' recent two-volume biography of the poet. True, Sir Edmund's book contains very few facsimiles and not all documents are transcribed in full or accurately. These facts considered, Dr. Lewis would have rendered the scholarly world yeoman service if his book were all that he claims for it. But is it? That it is not we shall show in the following pages.

In their brochure the publishers say, undoubtedly on the authority of Dr. Lewis, that this book "is complete" and presents, for the first time, "the entire corpus of the important documentary and contemporary printed material relating to Shakespeare." That this is an overstatement may be gathered from the fact that the following items have been omitted from the work before us: a letter from Sir Walter Cope to Viscount Cranbourne (written in 1604/05) relating to *Love's Labours Lost*, citation of Shakspeare as an actor in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* in 1603, a passage in commendation of Shakspeare in An. Sc's *Daiphantus* (1604), William Covell's reference to "Sweet Shakespeare" in *Polimanteia* (1595), John Weever's sonnet "Ad Gulielmum Shakespeare" (1595), and so forth. It is needless to say that such allusions to the poet are of the utmost importance in constructing something that may pass for a biography. They manifest the impression his personality and his art made upon his fellows. Dr. Lewis may, of course, plead that it was no part of his plan to quote and comment on the allusions to the great Stratfordian by those who knew him or read his works. But, if he does so, our reply will be that he quotes *some* contemporary allusions, e.g., the one in *Willobie his Avis* (1594), one in Chettle's *Englandes Mourning Garment* (1603), two in Manningham's diary, and the long passage in *Palladis Tamia*, etc. Most readers, we are confident, would rather read Weever's poem than the two-page account of an utterly insignificant

letter (written in 1631) from Sir Thomas Temple asking for two or three buds from Dr. Hall's garden. The space allotted to this could have been much more advantageously employed to discuss the Shakspeare-Davenant scandal, a subject wholly ignored by Dr. Lewis.

A vexatious feature of this book is the evident carelessness in the proofreading. In the index we find "Exemplification" for "Exemplification," "Furnival" for "Furnivall," "Gastrill" for "Gastrell," "Langbane" for "Langbaine," "Schuckings" for "Schucking," and "H. M. Spielman" for "M. H. Spielmann."

In book-making strange things are likely to happen, as a result of either carelessness or ignorance on the part of some one of the many persons sharing in the work. It would be difficult to say who is responsible for the mutilation of so many of the proper names occurring in *The Shakespeare Documents*, although the guilt undoubtedly lies mainly on the shoulders of the proof-reader. (We hope it was not Dr. Lewis.) Halliwell-Phillipps several times (54 a, 121 b, 182c, 402a) appears with only one lower case *p*; Morgann, the famous author of an essay on Falstaff, appears as 'Morgan' (279c); Steevens, the Puck of commentators, is changed to 'Stevens' (182c); the baptismal name of Edmond Malone, the most distinguished Irish scholar, is invariably given as "Edmund" (5b, 9a, 79b, 93c, 217a, etc.), a mistake also made by J. Q. Adams, E. K. Chambers, and even Sidney Lee; the middle name of Dr. J. Quincy Adams appears as "Quincey" sometimes (196b, 274c, 520a); Langbaine appears as 'Langbane' in the index and 'Langbraine' in the text (126a); Cuthbert Burby is changed into 'Cutler' Burby (286b); Julia 'Berner' appears as 'Berne' (304c); the well-known Grosart appears as 'Gosart' (201c); James A. Morgan loses his first name (201b), as does also Edwin A. Abbey (287a); Phelps appears as 'Phelp' (287b); Moxon appears as 'Moxom' (411a); the poet and essayist A. C. Brock is changed to 'Clutton-Brock' (without an initial, 363b); Mr. Cuninghame, editor and commentator, becomes 'Cunningham' (311c); the German writer Gersdorff is changed to 'Gersdoff' (362c); Dr. Leftwich becomes Dr. Leftwick (387c), the German Schroer is changed to Schöer (541b), and the French Lefranc is presented to us as 'Le Franc' (287b).

In a scholarly work one expects correct reproduction of words in foreign languages. An ignorance of German probably explains some of the errors in the names listed above as well as some of the following: 'Prose' for 'Prosa' (183b), 'Komodianten' for 'Komödianten' (201c), 'neuren' for 'der neueren' (201c), 'epitches' for 'episches' (262a), 'Tageleid' for 'Tagelied' (262b), 'Jahrhundredts' for 'Jahrhunderts' (262b), 'and' for 'und' (several times, *e.g.*, 262b, line 30), 'zur' for 'zu' (262c), 'Urbiler . . . Studies' for 'Urbilder . . . Studien' (280a, line 19), 'Verlorener' for 'Verlorene' (287a), 'Studien . . . neuren' for 'Studium . . . neueren' (287b), 'Vortag' for 'Vortrag' (312b), 'Buhme' for 'Bühne' (312b), 'Verbeitung' for 'Verbreitung' (312b), 'gelichnamigen' for 'gleichnamigen' (404c), 'die Sonnets Shakespeare' for 'die Sonette Shakespeares' (411a), 'Überlieferung' for 'Ueberlieferung' (541c), 'verschiedenen' for 'verschiedenen' (506c), etc. In citing the French title of Monsieur Lefranc's book (287b) the word 'Masque' is given as 'Mosque'. In the Italian title of Bonfante's book on wills 'Varii' is cited as 'Vraii' (507b).

Of purely typographical errors there is an abundance in these handsomely printed volumes. We shall list only a few: 'nonattendance' (without a hyphen, 77c), 'semiforged' (without a hyphen, 180b), 'overimaginative' (221c), 'Article' for 'Articles' (79c, line 39), '*Palladia*' for '*Palladis*' (179b), '*Anjon*' for '*Anjou*' (205c, line 3), 'Entstchung' for 'Entstehung' (262b, line 29), 'page 125' for 'page 135', (254a, line 19), 'Topographical' for 'Typographical' (299a), 'titling-spear' for 'tilting-spear' (302a, line 13), 'Earle' for 'Earl' (305b, line 37), 'House-Trap' for 'Mouse-Trap' (361a, line 47), 'Jonson' for 'Johnson' (365c, line 19), 'Mrs.' for 'Mr.' (363b, line 6), 'Magnificent' for 'Magnificent' (366a, line 41), and 'semigossipy' (229c) without a hyphen.

Misquotations also occur. On page 172 a passage from *Measure for Measure* is mutilated by the insertion of the unnecessary word 'outward' in the fourth verse ('Save that we do the outward denunciation lack') and the substitution of 'on' for 'upon' in the eleventh verse ('With character too gross is writ upon Juliet').

Probably merely as the result of hasty proofreading some sentences are improperly punctuated. "These new transcripts are as far as possible original" (vii b) requires commas after 'are' and 'possible'. "Of this extremely rare old 1605 *King Leir*, the British Museum has two copies" (390b) requires no comma after '*Leir*'. "This period may have been 1592-94, when because of the dreadful plague all theatres were closed" (408a) requires commas after 'when' and after 'plague'. "As a generous contribution to bibliography the Huntington Library in 1931 through the Harvard University Press issued a composite facsimile" (357a). "In Eadred's will, wearing apparel took its place" (486c) does not require the comma. "The complete Diary at present in the Folger Shakespeare Library should be re-edited" (526a, note) requires commas. "In 1597 William, who with his wife and family had resided at the Henley Street property since his marriage in 1582, bought" etc. (222a).

What was intended to give this book its chief value are, of course, the facsimiles of the documents bearing on Shakspeare's life. It is a great pity, therefore, that, owing to a number of technical errors—the employment of very heavy paper, the use of brown ink, poor presswork, and the resort to the half-tone process—many of the facsimiles are so pale as to be practically worthless. Some parts of the documents are almost wholly invisible. This appears especially in the reproduction of the 1582 marriage-bond, between pages 160 and 161, which may be compared with the much more easily decipherable reproduction in J. W. Gray's book, *Shakespeare's Marriage* (facing page 9); in the first draft of the application for a coat-of-arms in 1596 (opposite p. 210), which compares very unfavorably with the reduced facsimile published in S. Tucker's *The Assignment of Arms to Shakespeare and Arden*, noting especially the postscript in the lower right-hand corner (which is almost invisible in Lewis's book); in the letter from Richard Quiney to the poet (opposite p. 226), which shows up very clearly in the facsimiles published in other books, e.g., E. K. Chambers' biography of Shakspeare (vol. 2, p. 102); the 1598 note of corn and malt (facing p. 283), which is much more sharply defined in E. I. Fripp's *Shakespeare, Man and Artist*, vol. 2, facing p. 497; the deed of conveyance pertaining to the

Blackfriars property (between pp. 438-439), which should be compared with the vastly more legible facsimile—even though greatly reduced—in H. Staunton's *Memorials of Shakespeare*, published in 1864; the Shakspeare will (after p. 482) is paler than it need be, and so are many of the other documents.

The half-tone process by which these facsimiles have been reproduced is highly objectionable in a book planned for investigators. Inasmuch as in the study of some of these 'papers' questions of forgery, forged interpolations, and identity of the writer often arise, only the collotype process should have been employed. A collotype facsimile, if well made, shows depth and can be studied with a magnifying glass or low-power microscope; a half-tone cannot (because of the enlargement of the innumerable dots which distort the picture beyond recognition). No wonder Dr. Lewis makes the absurd statement (473c) that the signatures of the witnesses to Shakspeare's will were all written by one person and (208c) that the footnote in the first 1596 draft for a coat-of-arms is in the same handwriting as the body of the document. Such matters can be decided only by professional experts working with proper materials. The documentary materials here presented to the scholar are also defective, seriously so, in being considerably smaller than the originals, and without warning that they are so. Shakspeare's will, for example, has been reduced by about 25%. In scholarly works it is customary to say below a facsimile that it has been reduced or enlarged, and by how much.

And now we come to a much more important matter: Dr. Lewis as a decipherer or reader of documents written in the secretary script of Shakspeare's day. He says that his transcripts are "as far as possible, new, original and independent." It had been better if they had not been such. There are very few documents in these volumes which do not show more or less serious errors in transcription. On page 416 Dr. Lewis transcribes a document (shown in facsimile on the page facing it) which relates to Shakspeare as a contributor to a fund for repairing the highways and which seems not to have been previously transcribed; in his transcription he makes the following mistakes: for 'Inp^r[i]m[is]' he reads 'Imp^rm[i] s'; the surname 'Gibbes'

he misreads 'Silver'; Wilson's given name he transcribes as 'Thomas' though it is 'Henry'; in Sturley's name he omits a final *e*; in Shaw's name he omits a final *e*; the name of 'Lane' he reads as 'Lawe' and in our poet's surname he omits a final *e*. It may be noted that this document is written in easily legible and beautiful secretary script. Such misreadings are not surprising in view of the erroneous statements (pp. 162c-163a) made by Dr. Lewis that "the small and capital *h*" were "precisely alike" and that small initial *h* and *w* were easily confused. In the same paragraph Dr. Lewis makes the astounding statement—in the interests of the whitewashing process—that "it was an invariable [!] habit at that period [*i.e.*, about 1582] to curtail the terminal of a name."

In transcribing the first draft of the application for a coat-of-arms he failed to note that a certain number of words amounting almost to a whole line are an interlineation, even though the scribe took the precaution to have a caret in the proper place as well as another caret and a mark like a plus sign in front of the interlined words; but Dr. Lewis, ignoring these marks, transcribed the interlined words in the wrong place and did not have them printed in smaller type (as he does with other interlineations), giving us this absurd text: "they have continweed at those partes in good And that the said John having maryed Mary daughter & one of the heyres of Robert Arden of Wilmcote in the said counte gent reputacion & credit." Other errors in the transcription of this document are the following: 'Gentilnne' for 'Gentillme', 'authoritie' for 'authorite', 'maiestie' for 'maieste', 'demonstrcion' for 'demonstracion', 'testimonie' for 'testemonie', 'Throughe' for 'Thoroughe', 'Principalities' for 'Principalites', 'posteritie' for 'posterite', 'continweed' for 'contiweed', 'Collors' for 'Coulllores', 'Signefieing' for 'Signefieng', 'gent' for 'Gent', and two short wavy horizontal strokes for the word 'in' (even though on page 212 he calls the reader's attention to the fact that in Elizabethan documents the word 'in' sometimes looked 'like a short horizontal dash'—and, he should have added, with an *i*-dot above it).

On pages 156-157 Dr. Lewis transcribes Richard Hathaway's will, a very interesting document indeed, but the

transcription is regrettably marred with occasional errors. Some years ago I pointed out that in Shakspeare's will there is what looks like an ornamental flourish but is really the letters *R* and stands for the word 'Recognoscatur' (meaning 'Be it known'). In his discussion of the Shakspeare will Dr. Lewis mentions this fact, also (as I had pointed out) that this siglum occurs also in John Combe's will. It is curious, therefore, that Dr. Lewis did not see that this abbreviation occurs also opposite the first line (in the left margin) of the Hathaway will. He is guilty of the same oversight in transcribing the nuncupative will of Dr. John Hall (see facsimile opposite page 590). Other errors of transcription in Hathaway's will are the following: 'Twentieth' for 'Twentithe', 'parishee' for 'parisshe', 'Testment' for 'Testament', 'onlie' for 'oneli', 'that the' for 'that he the', 'guyde to' for 'guyde vnto', 'Englyssh' for 'Englysshe', 'Levied' for 'Levyed', 'Stratforde' for 'Stretforde', and 'Rich[ard]i' for 'Rich[ard]'. An extremely interesting little point in this will which Dr. Lewis overlooked (and has, therefore, erred in transcribing) pertains to the spelling of the word 'profits'. Dr. Lewis reproduces it as 'profette' but the scribe wrote (every time) 'profecte'. Had our author consulted the *Oxford Dictionary* he would have learned that 'profect' was a recognized variant for 'profit' in the sixteenth century. Elizabethan English is also ignored in transcribing 'abouts' (or is it 'aboutes'?) as 'about' on pages 283 and 284c.

Nowadays it is customary in the transcription of ancient documents to expand all abbreviations and contractions and to print in square brackets all added letters. This saves the research student much time and enables him to check and correct possible errors in the interpretation of the instrument. Dr. Lewis attempts to comply with the modern requirement but he is exasperatingly inconsistent and careless in doing so, as may be seen by an examination of almost any one of the transcriptions in this book. By way of example I shall select King James's warrant ordering a patent to be granted to the Lord Chamberlain's men in 1603 (see pages 364 & 365). In the words 'our' and 'your,' both occurring frequently here, Dr. Lewis prints 'o[ur]' and 'yo[ur],' implying that both the *u* and the *r* are wanting in the manuscript; but, as a matter of fact, the scribe invariably wrote 'o' and

'yo'. In line 6 the transcript has 'le[ttr]es' but the manuscript has 'lres' (with a flourish through the *l*); on page 365 we have 'Vniversitie' for 'Vniv'sitie' and 'liberties' for the manuscript's 'libties'. Other errors in this document are 'derected' for 'directed', 'licended' for 'licenced', 'doe' for 'doo', 'Hemminges' for 'Henninges', 'hereafter' for 'heerafter', 'hathe' for 'hath', 'whereof' for 'wherof &c', 'Greenewiche' for 'Greenwiche', and 'raigne' for 'Raigne'. It is to be wished that Dr. Lewis had been more faithful in reproducing the capital letters which begin many words in these documents. In one of the transcripts the brevi-graph for final *es* is represented, as it should be (because the symbol also stood for *s, as, is, ies, us, ous, and ys*) by a specially made character resembling our roman script *e*, but everywhere else Dr. Lewis substituted for this the letters *es* in square brackets. Why the inconsistency? In the transcription of symbols having variable values a scholar has no right to commit himself to one of their equivalents; if he does so, he lays himself open to the charge of prejudice or bias.

In his chapter on the spelling of the poet's surname, Dr. Lewis throws the weight of his influence in favor of "Shakespeare" because it is the form in which it occurs most frequently, although as far as extant evidence goes, the poet himself did not spell it thus. It is true that during Shakspeare's lifetime printers in London, whose spelling and pronunciation were undergoing modernization, preferred to set the name up with an *e* at the end of the first syllable and an *a* in the second, partly, no doubt, to emphasize the word-play in his name, but Shakspeare himself was an old-fashioned and conservative product of the country, a rustic, and adhered to early Renaissance forms, as did also most of his literary associates—a point which Dr. Lewis has overlooked or misconceived. He errs in saying (7b) that the surname on the flyleaf of a copy of Florio's translation of Montaigne's *Essays* is 'Shaksper'; if there be truth in sight, it is 'Shakspeare', although of the final *e* only parts of two horizontal curves are now visible, probably as the result of the pen's running dry.

The bibliographies appended to each of Dr. Lewis's chapters are wofully inadequate, apart from containing

many errors in the spelling of names and titles. In the bibliography of the spelling of Shakspeare's name a number of essential items have been omitted, most notably Dr. John L. Haney's *The Name of William Shakespeare: A Study in Orthography* (1906), F. Madden's "Observations on an Autograph of Shakspeare and the Orthography of his Name" (in *Archaeologia*, 1838, 27: 113-23), the lively controversy conducted by Dyce, D'Israeli, J. Bruce, Madden, Corney, Hunter, and others, in the pages of *Gentleman's Magazine* in and about 1840, Halliwell-Phillipps' *New Lamps or Old?*, and the present writer's essay in *The Dial* of May 11, 1916.

It would probably be difficult to subsume under one heading all the extraordinary statements one encounters in this book. There is, for example, the statement (207a) that Hamnet, the poet's son, may have been buried in Stratford church. In 1596 that would have been almost impossible. Shakspeare himself was interred there only because of the town's indebtedness to him for financial assistance, and that was years after 1596. Had Hamnet found his final resting place in the church, the spot would undoubtedly have been marked. Even more surprising is Dr. Lewis's assurance (169a) that William Shakspeare and Anne Hathaway, having entered into a common-law marriage, insisted on a formal church marriage so that the ambitions of the Shakspeare family to achieve the status of landed gentry might be realized. In support of this incredible assertion he says (175a): "a 'handfast' or pre-contract marriage, though valid, was inadequate because it would not clearly legitimize their children." Why the 'clearly'? we ask. And where is the evidence for the alleged ambition? In all probability a church ceremony was deemed advisable merely as evidence of the genuineness of an alleged pre-contract.

Momentary mental aberration—to which even the best are subject—probably explains the curious perversion in the following sentence: "The limited information we possess suggests that William Shakespeare came direct from *London to Stratford*—no doubt to seek his fortune" (182c). An equally shocking 'howler' occurs on page 300 (col. a) where we are told that Elizabeth became Queen November 17, 1599. On page 174 (col. c) Shakspeare's mother, Mary Arden, is converted into his "mother-in-law." If Homer

sometimes nodded, why may not a Shaksperian scholar occasionally lapse into somnolence?

A much more serious mistake, because, perhaps, more significant, is the statement (201a) that in Shakspeare's tragedies "a King John brutally burns out a little prince's eyes, [and] a King Lear gouges out an old man's eyes." Neither King John nor anyone else burned out Arthur's eyes; Hubert only threatened to do so. King Lear did not gouge out Gloster's eyes; Cornwall was guilty of that piece of business.

Evidences of other kinds of carelessness occur here and there. On page 225 (col. a) we find this: "Abstract of Title of the Title of the Trustees of the late Mr. John Payter to a Message" etc. Greg's *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* is referred to (206c) as *Two Elizabethan Stage Arrangements*. On page 362 Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch is named as J. D. Wilson's associate in the publication of an edition of *Hamlet* in 1934, although Q had (very wisely) severed his connection with that pattern of perversity, the new Cambridge Shakespeare, prior to the publication of this play. In 1924 J. M. Robertson published *An Introduction to the Study of the Shakespeare Canon*; on page 202 this title is reproduced as *An Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare, Canon*. If such things may have passage free, who shall our models and mentors be?

How helpful it would have been had Dr. Lewis given us facsimiles of all the documents, not only the important ones (who shall decide what is or may be important?), which enter into a biography of Shakspeare may appear from the following facts: on page 230 we are presented with a transcript of Halliwell-Phillipps' transcript of a letter from Adrian Quiney to his son, but when we compare the two transcripts with that given by E. K. Chambers in his *William Shakespeare* (2: 102-03—not mentioned by Lewis) we find the following differences: 'wylyng' for 'wylling', 'youre' for 'your', 'M^r' for 'y^e', 'W^m' for 'M^r', and 'that' for 'yt'.

At times Dr. Lewis expresses himself so clumsily that he lays himself open to the suspicion of purposive misstatement. In discussing the application for a coat-of-arms in 1596 he says (212 b & c): 'It [MS. Vincent 157, Article

24] may have been the draft from which William Dethick made the final 'fair copy' of the actual grant which, according to the statement in the document itself, was signed, sealed, and delivered to John and William Shakespeare." Nowhere in the papers relating to this or the 1599 application is William's name mentioned, but Dr. Lewis seems determined to connect the poet with his father's desire for heraldic honors.

Another bit of clumsy writing relates to Shakspeare's signature on the Belott-Mountjoy deposition. In that signature the poet hurriedly wrote the letters 'Shak' and a flourish which he may have intended, as I pointed out some years ago, for a combination of the long *s* and a *p'r* (*per*, *pere*, etc.) brevigraph. Dr. Lewis accepts this explanation but he makes the following misleading statement (432a) in connection therewith: "That this was the actual method of abbreviation used when others wrote down the name Shakespeare, one need but turn elsewhere in this volume to perceive," and then he refers the reader to the record of Shakspeare's holding of corn and malt in 1598 and to Richard Quiney's letter to the poet the same year. When we turn to these documents we discover that in neither case did the scribe make a *sp'r* brevigraph (as Shakspeare did) but that in each case the penman made a normal secretary *s* which he followed with the normal secretary *p'r* symbol. (Incidentally I may remark that this *p'r* character also appears regularly in the middle of words, though Dr. Lewis says it occurs only at the beginning and at the end.)

Such a sentence as the following, "This examination hence does not support Stephen I. Tucker," (208b) should not be permitted to occur in a book which has been produced by the expenditure of so much labor, brains and money. A writer in Dr. Lewis's position should not say (see 186a), "This volume is one of Richard Field's best work," nor 197b) "the text of Q1 and Q2 are substantially similar."

Returning for a moment to Shakspeare's will, a hastily and poorly drawn document, we may note that Dr. Lewis's discussion—a long and tedious chapter—deals with matters which are of no Shaksperian relevance whatever and in-

cludes many statements which are utterly mistaken and incorrect. It is perfectly clear that Dr. Lewis has not the faintest notion of what constitutes a contract when he speaks of 'contractual obligations' inherent in bequests contained in a will.

One thing more and I am through, although I am sorely tempted to comment on the many subjects so learnedly treated by Dr. Lewis. As we open the first volume and turn to the first printed page, the bastard title, our eye is struck with the drawing of the Shakspeare coat-of-arms, evidently made from the drawing in the present writer's pamphlet on the subject in 1908. However, when we examine the drawing critically we notice several serious defects in it: the shield is pure white though heraldic convention requires (as Dr. Lewis knows and says in 303b) a white surface covered with black dots; the two spears (except the points) ought also to be white with black dots (to symbolize gold); and—a very serious error—Shakspeare's falcon has lost one of his wings. In the 1596 and 1599 documents, preserved in the College of Arms, and facsimiled in the book before us, the falcon is shown with wings 'displayed' (spread wide and the tips directed slightly upward), as Dr. Lewis knows (302b). Whoever was responsible for this *faux pas* has played Dr. Lewis a shabby trick.

I hope I may be permitted to close this over-long review of an important contribution to Shaksperiana with the following familiar words from *Julius Caesar*:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>Brutus.</i> | I do not like your faults. |
| <i>Cassius.</i> | A friendly eye could never see such faults. |
| <i>Brutus.</i> | A flatterer's would not, though they do appear As huge as high Olympus. |

And, let me add, even though I have not read all of this book, Dr. Lewis's 'faults' are not Olympian.

A BORROWING FROM CAVICEO FOR THE LEGEND OF ROMEO AND JULIET

By WILLIAM F. J. DEJONGH

IN a few brief paragraphs I wish to trace back to an earlier piece of literature than has as yet been mentioned the source of Lady Capulet's explanation of Juliet's weeping, *Romeo and Juliet*, Act III, sc. v. The passage under consideration reads as follows:

Lady Cap. Why, how now, Juliet!

Juliet Madam, I am not well

Lady Cap. Evermore weeping for your cousin's death?
What, wilt thou wash him from his grave with tears?
An if thou couldst, thou couldst not make him live;
Therefore, have done. some grief shows much of love;
But much of grief shows still some want of wit.

Juliet. Yet let me weep for such a feeling loss.

The first author to tell the story of Shakspeare's tragedy—at least with the principal characters named as they appear in the play—was Luigi da Porto. The Da Porto story was versified by Gherardo Boldieri, who took the pseudonym *Clizia*, in 1553. The mother of Da Porto's Giulietta explained her daughter's comfortlessness as arising from Giulietta's wish to be married. Professor Olin H. Moore has shown¹ that to *Clizia* goes the credit of observing that Tebaldo's death and the decree of Romeo's exile occurred in such quick succession that Giulietta's weeping over her husband's fate might be excused just as well by reason of Tebaldo's death. This was no invention of Clizia, however.

The heroine of the *Libro del Peregrino*, by Jacopo di Antonio Caviceo (1443-1511), spends many tearful moments reflecting upon her lover's infidelity. Her mother mistakenly attributes her daughter's weeping to the young woman's sadness about the murder of a brother—an incident which took place before the young woman (Genevera) had any inkling of Peregrino's escapade with a friend of hers. The mother reproaches her daughter with these words:

Genevera, insino a quanto hai tu deliberata imporre fine a questi

tuoi lamenti? Il statuto de Dio, ne per lachryme, ne per gemiti se muta. Perdona de affigere questa mia ultima era, e pensa per altra via de consolare l'alma del morto fratello, perche il tanto ricordare e uno accende novo dolore, qual più a chi il porta nuoce, che per chi è portato.² ("Genevera, at what time have you resolved to impose an end upon these laments of yours? The decree of God is not changed either by tears or by groans. Cease to afflict this my old age and think of comforting your dead brother's soul in some other way, because a memory so vivid excites new pain which hurts more the one who bears it than the one for whom it is borne.")

The *Peregrino* was published in 1508, and it had gone through its eighteenth reimpresion four years before the publication of Clizia's rimed octaves.³ The accessibility of *Peregrino* to Clizia and his indebtedness to Caviceo's novel are the natural conclusions that follow from a comparison of dates. Matteo Bandello appropriated this well-motivated detail from Clizia and passed it on to Pierre Boaistuau, who, in turn, sent it north of the English Channel.

University of New Mexico.

¹"Bandello and 'Clizia,'" *Modern Language Notes*, LII, 1937, pp. 41, 42.

²I read a copy of the *Peregrino* owned by the Arsenal Library, Paris: Venice, 1524, in-8, page L, viii recto.

³Adolfo Albertazzi, *Romanzi e romanzi del cinquecento e del seicento*, Bologna, 1891, pp. 10, 11, *apud notas*.

NOTES ON SHYLOCK, ANGELO AND FALSTAFF

By A. S. PUSHKIN

(Translated by Mr. Albert Siegel from the original.
vol. 6, ed "Slowo", 1922)

THE characters portrayed by Shakspeare are not, like Molière's, types of this particular passion or that particular vice, but are living beings filled with many passions, many vices; the circumstances unfold before the spectator their variety and their complex aspects. With Molière *l'Avare* is "avare"—and only that; with Shakspeare *Shylock* is greedy, sagacious, revengeful, philoprogenitive, perspicacious. In Molière the hypocrite trails after the wife of his benefactor—the hypocrite; asks for a glass of water—from the hypocrite. In Shakspeare the hypocrite pronounces a court verdict with conceited austerity, but with equity; he justifies his heartlessness with the thoughtful considerations of a statesman; he courts innocence with captivating sophistry and not with ludicrous concoctions of devotion and gallantry. *Angelo* is a hypocrite because his known actions contradict his secret passions! And what depth in this character!

But nowhere, perhaps, is reflected with such multiformity Shakspeare's many-sided genius as in *Falstaff*, whose vices, entangled one with another, form an amusing and ugly chain resembling an ancient bacchanalia. Analyzing the character of *Falstaff*, we see that his principal trait is lust. From the time of his youth, probably, a coarse, cheap gallantry was his first preoccupation; but he is already in his fifties. He has grown fat, senile; gluttony and wine have subdued *Venus*. Besides, he is a coward; but, having spent his life with young rakes, at every moment exposed to their mockery and tricks, he covers up his cowardice with an evasive and scoffing impertinence; he is a braggart by habit and by calculation. *Falstaff* is by no means stupid; on the contrary, he has the habits of a man who at times gives the impression of being good company. He has no principles whatsoever. He is a sissy. He needs strong Spanish wine (sack), huge dinners and money for his mis-

tresses; to get these he is ready for anything provided it involves no visible danger.

In my youth chance brought me in contact with a man in whom Nature, desiring to imitate Shakspeare, repeated his wonderful creation. Mr. * * * was a second Falstaff. Lusty, cowardly, vainglorious, not stupid, amusing, unprincipled, lachrymose, and fat. One circumstance added to him an original charm: he was married. Shakspeare did not have time to get his bachelor married. Falstaff died in the house of his mistresses, without having the time to become either a betrayed husband or the father of a family. How many scenes lost for Shakspeare's paint brush!

Here is an incident from the family life of my honorable acquaintance. His four year old son, the very image of his father, a little Falstaff III, one day, in his absence, repeated to himself: "How blave my daddy is! how the Lold loves my daddy" The little boy was overheard and was asked, "Who told you that?" "Daddy," answered the boy.

CORRECTIONS

We ask our readers to correct the name "Lewery" on our contents page and on page 103 to "Lowery" and to read "*upon*" for "*on*" instead of "*on* for *upon*" in the penultimate line of page 108

ANNOUNCEMENT

Having this page at my disposal, for want of a short article or communication, I take advantage of the opportunity to tell the readers of this BULLETIN something about my *Elizabethan Bibliographies*. Four or five years ago I announced in these pages that I had ready for publication material for an encyclopedic bibliography of everything pertaining to the Elizabethan era, including all the poets, dramatists, essayists, politicians, adventurers, novelists, pamphleteers, rascals, etc. I was also planning, on the basis of material I had accumulated during many years of persistent research bibliographies on the language, politics, statesmanship, religion, witchcraft, folklore, law, medicine, architecture, costuming, agriculture, sports, criminology, science, wars, etc., of the period. Foreigners who influenced English life and thought, *e g.*, Montaigne, Erasmus, Machiavelli, etc., were to be included. The bibliographies dealing with Shakspeare were to include references to all published (and much unpublished) material relating to his plays and poems, to adaptations of his works (including translations and burlesques—the two often go together), to musical settings for his songs (and operas based on his plays), to illustrations, to costuming, to stage history and staging, to their influence on succeeding writers, to the editors and their squabbles, to actors in Shakspeare's plays and anecdotes and gossip about them, and so forth. I suggested that some university or philanthropist might be interested in financing the publication of this work. As might have been expected, no one responded. Without influence of a certain kind such things do not get done, not in our social system.

Thereupon I consulted a well-known publisher of bibliographies who agreed to bring out the work if I could induce some wealthy individual to subsidize the undertaking. Not

being accustomed to begging, I bade the publisher a courteous farewell and decided to become my own publisher. Since that day in 1937 I have published twenty-three bibliographies in seventeen volumes. These include bibliographies of Christopher Marlowe, the first in the series, Ben Jonson, John Fletcher, Francis Beaumont, Philip Massinger, Robert Greene, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, John Lyly, Thomas Lodge, George Peele, Thomas Middleton, Thomas Kyd, John Webster, John Ford and Thomas Nashe. In the Shakspeare field there have appeared bibliographies of the *Sonnets*, of *Macbeth*, of *The Merchant of Venice* and *King Lear*. Within the next few weeks will be published bibliographies of Michael Drayton and Sir Philip Sidney. These will be followed by *Othello*.

The books, I may say, are beautiful specimens of the bookmaker's art, having been designed by my friend George Grady of the Strawberry Hill Press. The George Banta Publishing Company is sparing no efforts to carry out Mr Grady's design and to make the books as attractive and as nearly perfect as such books should be. In the compilation and arrangement of the material only the interests and the needs of the scholar, including candidates for college degrees, and producers of the plays have been considered.

The edition is strictly limited to 300 copies of each book; the paper is of a good quality and the binding is substantial and attractive. The printing (inking and presswork) is perfect. The prices of the books are so reasonable that I hope to do no more than to recover the actual cost of printing, binding and mailing.

Because of what I know about the ethics of book reviewing in our day and the motives of the general run of reviewers, I send out no review copies to our learned periodicals.

S. A. T.

A SECOND DANIEL

Editor of the *Bulletin*:

Much Shaksperian criticism is, as you know, absurd, and a large percentage of it is hardly worth the paper, ink and postage necessary to give it publicity. "Which Daniel?" (in the January, 1941, issue of the *Bulletin*) inspires certain comments, which are perhaps superfluous—for, if Mr Hannigan convinces any reader, that reader is convinced, and if he does not, no harm is done.

Mr. Hannigan overlooks (it seems to me) an important point which modern scholars are likely to overlook: namely, the background of the Elizabethan audience. The people had been long familiar with the story of Susanna and the Elders in art, it was a popular subject, often treated, as any visitor to European galleries must know. And the sixteenth-century public had a memory of *Nice Wanton*, where the Judge is appropriately named Daniel—though Mr Hannigan, with the "Judgment of Solomon" in mind, might have given him another name.

Whether the Daniel of the Apocrypha is the same as that of the canonical book, or another, is here unimportant. Mr. Hannigan indulges in sarcasm: "It is known that the reference [in the play] is not to the canonical Book of Daniel but to the apocryphal History of Susanna," says [Mr. Gordon's] article. Known to whom, pray? Is the knowledge a secret, held by a select few? Has Mr. Hannigan forgotten his Rolfe (1880), where in a note to act IV, scene i, we read: "*A Daniel come to judgment*. The allusion is to the History of Susanna, 45: 'The Lord raised up the holy spirit of a young youth, whose name was Daniel,' etc." In verse 50, we find "God hath given thee the honour of an elder." I am sure that most annotated

editions of *The Merchant of Venice* will repeat this note. In Professor Macarthur's *Biblical Literature and Its Backgrounds* (1936), p. 354 f., is noted. "Persons well versed in the Bible, wandering through the art galleries of Europe, have been perplexed by the frequent recurrence of an apparently sacred theme entitled 'The Chaste Susanna,' Susanna and the Elders,' or 'Susanna at the Bath.' It was very popular with the Renaissance painters, who did not find many opportunities in pictures based on Holy Writ, to introduce the undraped female figure. These same Bible students have also wondered about Shylock's commendation of Portia in the words, 'A Daniel come to judgment.' Nothing in the Book of Daniel, as they know it, seems to fit the speech. Both the picture and the saying are explained by this second addition to Daniel.

"It is, like that of David and Bathsheba, a sordid little story . . ." After his cleverness in convicting the Elders, "from that day forth, was Daniel had in great reputation in the sight of the people" (Cf the *History of Susanna*, set apart from the beginning of Daniel, because it is not in the Hebrew, as neither the Narration of *Bel and the Dragon*, verse 64).

Portia, of course, was not really a judge—rather an attorney. The Duke presided at the trial. But like Daniel, (who was attorney for the defence, not a judge, she was interested in seeing justice done—in rescuing the weak from the strong. In Miss Margaret B. Crook's *The Bible and Its Literary Associations* (1937), p. 77, we read "The Book of Daniel, as we know it, belongs to the three years of the initial struggle under Judas Maccabæus.

The name 'Daniel' appears in the literature of Ras Shamra as that of the god [more properly, hero] who judges the cause of widows and orphans . . .

In the book of *Ezekiel* [xiv: 14] he is named with Noah and Job as a wise [virtuous] man of old . . . Daniel is associated indifferently with Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, with Belshazzar, the last of the Babylonian kings [more properly, regent], or with Darius of Persia . . . And in both the Apocrypha and the canonical book, with Cyrus.

Professor E. E. Stoll, who is one of our soundest Shaksperian scholars, wrote on "Shakespeare's Jew" in the *University of Toronto Quarterly* for January, 1939: cf. esp. p. 152: "Of what would the figure of Shylock remind the audience? Of Jews at first hand they may have known little. There were Jews in England, but illegally and by connivance. As I have suggested, he would rather remind them of the precisians and Pharisees in their midst, who 'put on gravity,' were keen on money and, more than other Christians, addicted to usury. They, too, were given to Biblical phrasing and scriptural allusions, preferably of the Old Dispensation . . ." One might add that the Elizabethan had in his background the Herod and Pilate of the miracle-play; the *Play of the Sacrament* (where the Jew is that of Chaucer's Prioress's Tale), the *Jew of Malta* (also a usurer, reminiscent of Greed, one of the Deadly Sins often brought into the morality-play), and the figure of Dr. Lopez. But, as Professor Stoll adds, in the article cited (p. 154): "He [Shylock] is not a fair or faithful presentation of the Jewish type," and "In prejudice he [the Jew] was created . . . for, like every popular artist, especially a dramatist, Shakespeare shared the opinions and morals, the sympathies and antipathies of his public . . ." Shylock has become a "hero" only in modern times¹

Were it worth while, we might note unconvincing parallels in Mr. Hanni-

gan's commentary. Portia is not called into her rôle "unexpectedly," for she conceives her plan and puts it into execution with Nerissa (III, iv, 45 f., 81 f.), she does not discover a "forgotten enactment," but, as Bellario's letter makes clear, "we turned o'er many books together. [Balthasar] is furnished with my opinion, which, bettered with his own learning . . . comes with him at my importunity to fill up your Grace's request in my stead." (IV, i, 150 f.) Belshazzar is not made to become a Christian, and Shylock does not die (the Duke gives him his life before he asks it—IV, i, 369); in Shakspeare, dreams are neither forgotten nor dreamed; there is no cryptic inscription nor ambiguous legal complex. Daniel Deronda has nothing to do with the question—any more than Samuel Daniel, who was at least familiar to the Elizabethan, no one has suggested that the name "Daniel" was unfamiliar to either Jew or Christian.

Mr Gordon's paper, which evoked Mr Hannigan's, pointed out a source behind a source, he mentions no "right" or "wrong" Daniel. I suspect that Mr Hannigan missed the point of Mr. Gordon's contribution. I might even suggest that Mr Hannigan had gone into the lion's den, without divine aid.

ROBERT WITHINGTON.

Northampton, Mass.

¹Cf. *Excursions in English Drama* (1937), esp pp 168-173.

THE FENCING MATCH IN HAMLET

By ALLAN H. GILBERT

In the *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* for January, 1941, the Editor objects to the explanation of the change of foils given by Mr Horace S. Craig,¹ and refers to an article by Miss Selma

Guttman, entitled "The Fencing Bout in *Hamlet*," in *The Shakespeare Bulletin*, 14 (1939): 86-100. Having discussed the matter of sword and dagger, Miss Guttman decides that "Shakespeare intended the match to be played with rapiers only" (p. 99). In this conclusion she is in agreement with Egerton Castle, who deals with the matter in his *Schools and Masters of Fence* (London, 1885). Castle explains it from the *Traicté contenant les secrets du premier livre sur l'espée, seule*, by Henry de Saint-Dicier, published at Paris in 1573. The French author mentions various ways of seizing an adversary's sword, and illustrates them by pictures of a combat between the Lieutenant and the Prevost. In explanation of figures he reproduces, Castle writes:

"One of these examples is reproduced here, as it results in the adversaries exchanging swords, an incident which often occurred in rapier-play.²

"The Lieutenant, who came on guard left foot foremost, delivers an estoc at the Prevost by passing his right foot forward. The Prevost draws his left foot back, crosses his opponent's sword, fort on faible, nails up, and suddenly bringing his left foot again to the front, seizes the Lieutenant's sword. He keeps his own point menacing his adversary's face, and tries to wrench the sword away (Fig. 31).

"Voicy la fin de la première prise presque exécutée par ledit Prevost deffendeur contre ledit Lieutenant

"The Lieutenant, thus finding himself in jeopardy, bends his body to the right and brings up his left foot, seizing at the same time the Prevost's hilt round the quillons. (Fig. 32)

"Either party, by twisting the quillons of his adversary's sword, obtains the advantage of leverage over the sword hand. The shortest plan at this juncture is evidently for either to abandon his own sword and continue the fight with that of his opponent, as is shown by figure 33, where the fencers are seen in the act of falling back and passing their rapiers from the left hand to the right."¹

This exchange is to be expected

when both contestants are as skillful as Hamlet and Laertes. When one is more expert than the other, the scene will be similar to that in the fight between Zelmane and Lycurgus described by Sir Philip Sidney, each is armed with a sword suited both for cutting and thrusting and with a shield:

"He striking a maine blow at her head, she warded it with the shield, but so warded, that the shield was cut in two pieces, while it protected her, & withall she ran in to him, and thrusting at his brest, which he put by with his traget, as he was lifting up his sword to strike again, she let fall the piece of her shield, and with her left hand catching his sword of the inside of the pommel, with nimble & strong sleight, she had gotten his sword out of his hand before his sence could convey to his imagination, what was to be doubted. And having now two swords against one shield, meaning not foolishly to be ungrateful to good fortune, while he was no more amazed with his being unweapened, then with the suddainnes thereof, she gave him such a wound upon his head in despite of the shields over-weak resistance, that withal he fel to the ground."¹

Any reader of *Hamlet* who insists that the fight is with rapier and dagger can assume that Laertes and the Prince abandoned their daggers as Zelmane did her shield.

Duke University.

¹"Dueling Scenes and Terms in Shakespeare's Plays," in *University of California Publications in English*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1-28. Mr Craig gives a bibliography in footnote 1.

²"Shakespeare shows himself as well acquainted with the art of fence as with most other subjects in his stage directions concerning the fencers in the last act of *Hamlet*" (Castle's note).

¹p. 59 On p. 74 Castle reproduces a plate from Joachim Meyer's *Gründliche Beschreibung der Freyen, Ritterslichen und Adlichen Kunst der Fechtens* (Strasbourg, 1670), showing several pairs of fencers. In each of two of the pairs one contestant is grasping his adversary's hilt.

¹*Arcadia*, Cambridge, 1922, pp. 514-5 (book 3, chap. 28).

HOW MUCH OF SHAKSPERE DID VOLTAIRE KNOW?

The latest and one of the most readable of the numerous biographies of Voltaire gives rise to a question when it makes the assertion that Voltaire apparently knew only six of the plays of Shakspeare.¹ The statement would seem incredible in light of the fact that the French critic was one of the greatest deprecators of Shakspeare that literary criticism has known. It is logical to expect that a person of Voltaire's genius and erudition would exhaust all materials available in the hope of obtaining evidence to support his contention that Shakspeare was a "grossier buffon." In fact, a thorough survey of the fifty-two volumes of Voltaire's works shows that he knew twelve plays by Shakspeare instead of just six. However, his knowledge of these plays was, in most cases, superficial. A number of them were studied merely for the purpose of amassing evidence of the vulgarity and obscenity of the English bard.

The Shaksperian plays alluded to by Voltaire, with the location of the references in the Moland edition, are as follows:

Julius Caesar is reworked as *la Mort de César*, III, 322-366; it is translated, VII, 439-483; and it is referred to in many places.

Hamlet is summarized in *du Théâtre Anglais*, XXIV, 193-200, and is referred to countless times.

Macbeth is compared with the *Medée* in *Commentaires sur Corneille*, XXXI, 197, it is referred to in many places, especially in letters to M. Duclos on December 25, 1761, and January 20, 1762; the drunken porter scene is harshly criticized in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, XXX, 354.

Othello is discussed and mentioned

a great many times, e.g., XXII, 149, XXIV, 298-311; XXV, 159.

Richard III is treated in a letter to Madame la Marquise du Défant, December 9, 1670, XLI, 91.

Romeo and Juliet is referred to in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, wherein part of the first scene is translated, XXX, 360-361, Ducis's translation is referred to as having been read in letters to M. le Comte d'Argental, September 5 and October 21, 1772, XLVIII, 164 and 192, and to M. Marmontel, November 1, 1772, XLVIII, 209.

King Lear is discussed in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, and a number of the speeches are translated, XXX, 362.

Henry V has part of Act V, Scene II, translated in *Art Dramatique*, XVII, 400-402, in the same essay the fourth scene of Act III is discussed, and in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, certain speeches are translated and discussed, XXX, 354.

Antony and Cleopatra has forty lines translated in the *Art Dramatique*, XVII, 399-400, the seventh scene of Act II is treated, and part of it is translated, in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, XXX, 368.

Troilus and Cressida is referred to in the *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, wherein scene 1 of Act I, scene VIII of Act V, and fourteen lines of the seventh scene of Act V are translated.

Henry IV, Part II, is commented upon in a footnote in *l'Homme au Quarante Écus*, XXI, 366. An entire speech by Falstaff is translated.

Coriolanus is mentioned briefly in the preface to *Oedipe*, II, 49.

PERCY G. ADAMS.

Austin, Texas.

¹George Brandes, *Voltaire*, translated by O. Kruger and P. Butler (N. Y., Tudor Publishing Co., 1934), p. 191.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

THE AMERICAN SHAKSPERE

We are in receipt of ten volumes of a new edition of Shakspeare's plays and poems, published by Ginn and Company, of Boston, which we propose to call 'the American Shakspeare' because it is edited by a genuine as well as distinguished American scholar and teacher, George Lyman Kittredge, and in the American manner, that is, without the humbug, the fol-de-rol and the blare of trumpets characteristic of recent English editions. The books are free from nonsense about Shakspeare's imagery and from absurdities masquerading as 'bibliography.' The volumes now at hand deal with *The Tempest*, *As You Like It*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Henry IV (Part I)*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*. The books are beautifully printed, on sufficiently heavy paper not to permit annoying 'look-through,' cloth bound, of convenient pocket size (7" x 5"), and selling for only 65c a piece. Each play is preceded by a brief but adequate and wholly original introduction, and is followed by many pages of commentary, illustrative notes and paraphrases. These are succeeded by textual notes and a glossarial index.

The distinguishing feature of this edition is the sturdy common sense of the paraphrastic equivalents of Elizabethan idioms. Professor Kittredge's wide reading in Elizabethan letters and his great acquaintance with the classics stand him in good stead, even though now and then he is inclined to over-elaborate the classical allusions and parallels. All who know Dr. Kittredge know, of course, that

he has his quirks—and whose blood and passion are so well commingled that he has not? These will not be too astonished to find him maintaining, for example, that Macbeth and his fiend-like queen had *not* discussed the disposing of Duncan before the opening of the play, and that King Lear (suffering from 'feverous delirium') is not insane but his Fool is. In view of the many good things to be found in this edition, we can overlook these eccentricities. When all is said, we are all human. Compared with some recent dark stars in the Elizabethan welkin, this Kittredge star sticks fiery off indeed.

The novice wandering in the Shaksperian jungle will do well to be guided by his light—if he watches his step.

SHAKSPERE IN RUSSIA.

'Shakspeare in the Russian theatre' is a series of books of which the first, dealing with Alexander Ostuzhev in the role of Othello (*Ostuzhev Othello*) was published in Moscow in 1938. It is a nicely-printed paper-covered booklet of 76 pages and consists of four chapters: A study of the play by M. M. Morozov, Ostuzhev as Othello, by S. E. Redlov; and the production of the play, by A. D. Gotlib. A portrait of Ostuzhev, in colors and in costume, serves as a frontispiece.

The second book in the series deals with *Ira Aldridge*, the distinguished American negro actor. This is a well-bound book of 190 pages, published in 1940. It consists of eleven chapters, by S. Durylin, discussing Aldridge's theatrical career in America, Germany, England, and Russia. Other

chapters deal with his performances as Shylock, King Lear, Macbeth and Othello, and his art in general. Three pages are devoted to his appearances in non-Shaksperian comedies. Ten inserted plates, including a frontispiece portrait (in collotype) and a facsimile, illustrate the commentary.

The third book, also published in 1940, is entitled, in Russian, *The Taming of the Shrew in the Central Theatre of the Red Army*, is a well-printed and paper-bound booklet of 88 pages. It consists of five chapters by as many

writers. The first, by M. M. Morozov, discusses the comedy; the second, by A. D. Popov, discusses the servants in the play, the fourth, by G. N. Boyadzhiev, the manner of producing *The Taming*, and the last, by N. Shifrin—the artist who has illustrated the book with ten beautiful colored plates showing costumes and stage sets—deals with the problems of the illustrator.

The books are published in Moscow by the Government Press and under the general editorship of Mr. M. M. Morozov.

July, 1941

Vol. XVI, No. 3

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



Images in the *Faerie Queene* Drawn From
Flora and Fauna

Hamlet and the Gonzago Murders

A Note on Wilson's *Hamlet*

Jonson and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

The True Text of *King Lear*

Etc.

Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

691 West 118th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters: 601 WEST 113TH STREET

New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH

15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.

Major Edward Bowes

Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.

Hardin Craig, Ph.D.

Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.

Frank Gilmore

Walter Hampden

Frank J. Hogan

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.

George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.

Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.

Fritz Leibler

Roland B. Lewis, Ph.D.

Joshua K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.

John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.

Julia Marlowe, LL.D.

Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.

Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.M.

Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.

Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D.

Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.

Annelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.

Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.

Otis Skinner, A.M.

Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.

John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison

70 Broadway

New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum

601 West 113th Street

New York

Board of Directors

1928

John Robert Gregg

Paul Kaufman

Robert M. Smith

Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1927

Miss Olive I. Carter

Arthur Haine

Frank L. Short

Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1926

George W. Davison

John E. Hannigan

John H. H. Lyon

Miss Charlotte E. Porter

A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON

| | | |
|---------|------------|-------|
| VOL XVI | JULY, 1941 | No. 3 |
|---------|------------|-------|

C O N T E N T S

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Images in <i>The Faerie Queene</i> Drawn from Flora and Fauna | 131 |
| Grace Warren Landrum | |
| The True Text of <i>King Lear</i> | 140 |
| Leo Kirschbaum | |
| A Note on Wilson's <i>Hamlet</i> | 154 |
| N. B. Allen | |
| "Making the Green One Red" | 166 |
| Russell K. Alspach | |
| <i>Hamlet</i> and the Gonzago Murders | 169 |
| Samuel A. Tannenbaum | |
| The Relation between <i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i> and Jonson's <i>Every Man is His Humour</i> | 175 |
| Sallie Sewell | |
| Communication: Portia, Daniel, Susanna | 190 |
| John E. Hannigan | |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Mr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

IMAGES IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE* DRAWN FROM FLORA AND FAUNA

By GRACE WARREN LANDRUM

(*Concluded*)

The eagle, almost the sole bird surviving figuratively in the modern world, is of course symbolical in Spenser as in the mediæval bestiaries. He is not only triumphant over prey, but lordly, raising his plumes at sight of a victim, rising fresh from the ocean, his eyes able to face the sun so steadily that Contemplation is likened to him.⁹⁸ The plumes of the Great Dragon are like an eagle's. Duessa's claws are those of an eagle.

Birds collectively in splendid gardens and individually on the wing charmed the poet. From generalizations of birds "glad of joyous Pryme," well worn after Chaucer's "as fayne as fowel is of the brighte sonne," he passes to the bird "glad of tempest gon," signifying Florimel's desire for rest in the witch's hut.⁹⁹ He uses *nest* figuratively, sometimes only for a rime. Malbecco "mewes" Hellenore from all men's sight.¹⁰⁰ Spenser rings the changes on the usual Elizabethan comparisons involving the dove. Though one expression brought extravagant praise from Leigh Hunt,¹⁰¹ the figures scarcely deserve listing. To continue, the peacock signifies the rich beauty of the image under the altar in the House of Busirane,¹⁰² and again the ludicrous pride of Braggadocchio.¹⁰³ The disciples of Cymænt are as swift as a swallow.¹⁰⁴ Talus pursues with the speed of a swallow. The course of Phædria's shallop is likewise compared. The messenger of Morpheus is "light as a chearefull larke."¹⁰⁵ Phædria's song is as loud as a lark's. Diana's flight from the Faun is like that of a "darred lark." The plumes of "painted jays" are mentioned.¹⁰⁶ Chaunticleer is the "native belman of the night," that "rings his silver bell to every sleepy wight."¹⁰⁷ The "crane's stately stalking" symbolizes "overweening pride";¹⁰⁸ his neck typifies Gluttony.¹⁰⁹ A withered skin is like a "dried rooke."¹¹⁰ Nocturnal birds were repellant to Spenser (as the *Epithalamion* proves) :

"Even all the nation of unfortunate
 And fatall birds about them flocked were,
 Such as by nature men abhorre and hate,
 The ill-faste Owle, deaths dreadfull messengere,
 The hoars Night-raven, trump of dolefull dreere,
 The lether-winged Bat, dayes enemy,
 The ruefull Strich still waiting on the bere,
 The Whistler shrill, that who so heares, doth dy,
 The hellish Harpies, prophets of sad destiny."¹¹¹

Osgood notes the figures concerning bait as "one of Spenser's characteristic images." It occurs no less than twenty-six times. He was evidently a devoted angler.¹¹² Brief metaphors involve "glorious bait," "bounteous baytes," "to illude him with such bait," "guileful bait," "bait of bestiall delight," the "pleasing bait of poetry." In a longer metaphor Clarinda is a "foolish maid," "heedless of the hooke."¹¹³ The expressive "subtill nets" coupled with "engins of wit"¹¹⁴ probably but not necessarily concerns fishing. Despite the frequency of figures from angling, one is surprised that no fish are specifically named. He is thus in sharp contrast with Shakspeare, who mentions carp, cod, dace, luce, pike, trout, salmon.¹¹⁵ Since Spenser is remarkably specific in figures from game birds, I incline to think he was less interested in fishing than in hunting, however more congenial the gentler sport might seem to have been.

Trapping is mentioned, naturally, of course. It is unimportant to visualize the particular game to be ensnared. Perhaps Spenser had never set traps for moles, but he did not forget them. In the delightfully prolix catalogue of English rivers, where he becomes even a sportive punster, he writes of the

"Mole that like a nousing Mole doth make
 His way still under ground till Thamis be overtake."¹¹⁶

Few poets one would like to visualize more surely than Spenser at Kilcolman. The landscape today justifies his enthusiasm; the charming ruins at Buttevant suggest much, but an actual day with the poet, not in litigation with Lord Rocke, but (presumably) supervising cattle, sheep, and swine on his three thousand acres, would be revealing.

In figures based on cattle Spenser has given almost the life story of creatures peculiarly important in Irish folk-

lore (whether or not Spenser chanced to know it). The braying of Orgoglio is like the noise of bulls:

"He loudly brayd with beastly yelling shoud,
That all the fields rebellowed againe,
As great a noyse, as when in Cymbrian plaine
An heard of Bulles, whom kindly rage doth sting,
Do for the milkie mothers want complaine,
And fill the fields with troublous bellowing,
The neighbour woods around with hollow murmur ring"¹¹⁷

Similarly, Adicia, wife of the Sultan, is

"like an enraged cow
That is berobbed of her younglings dere"

From the passive beast "appointed for the stall" he draws a simile. His figure of the cud of sweet and bitter fancy is the "cud of griefe and inward pain,"¹¹⁸ and the "cud of lover's carefull plight."¹¹⁹ Likewise, a vivid scene of the breaking of a steer depicts the struggle of Disdain and Scorn against "a gentle squire."¹²⁰ Spenser sees steers "astonished by a beast of strange and forraine race" in their midst.¹²¹ Scudamour is

"like to a mazed steare
That yet of mortalls stroke the stound doth beare."¹²²

Combats between knights are likened to encounters of fierce bulls. Bull-baiting, of course, appears figuratively.¹²³ The madness of Furor is likened to that of the blindfold bull. Classic scenes also recur to Spenser. Marinell, unhorsed by Britomart, is like the ox garlanded for sacrifice.¹²⁴ The Blatant Beast subdued by Calidore is like a bullock "felled to ground by butcher's hand."¹²⁵ A figure of literary effort completed appears in Stanza 45 of the first edition of Book III.¹²⁶

"But now my terme begins to faint and fayle,
All woxen weary of their journall toyle:
Therefore I will their sweated yokes assayle
At this same furrowes end, till a new day."

Spenser has done more than re-echo contemporary conventional pastoralism. Una's lamb, Biblical, not classical in origin, counts high among symbolic animals. Far more realistic are figures of the "trembling lamb,"¹²⁷ of Una's emotion when pursued, like that of a lamb seized by a wolf;¹²⁸ of the closeness of younglings to their dam;¹²⁹ of

rams in conflict, signifying the combat of Redcross and the Sarazin;¹³⁰ of a crowd running "like sheep in narrow fold."¹³¹ The sight of scattered sheep motivated several comparisons.¹³² Babes are slain as "sheep out of the fold."¹³³ Throughout these figures Spenser is convincing, as he is also in mentions of wild goats. Similes drawn from their movements have evoked praise from commentators, who have traced them to Ariosto.¹³⁴ The goat as a symbol of Lechery is, of course, a stock figure.

Gluttony in the procession to the House of Pride is, obviously, mounted on swine. To the tusks of a boar are likened the teeth of lust. The crest of the Great Dragon is like the upreared bristles of a "chauffed boar." Satyrane and Sansloy in conflict resemble wild boars.¹³⁵ A homely picture, that of November in the Pageant of the Months, suggests the hog-killing of a Virginia plantation today:

"Next was November, he full grosse and fat,
As fed with lard, and that right well might seeme;
For, he had been a fattening hogs of late,
That yet his browes with sweat did reek and steem"¹³⁶

Spenser, with a gift for capturing beauty in motion, is naturally attracted by the swiftness of the stag. The flight of Florimel from the Witch's Son is like that of a hind.¹³⁷ A nymph flees in similar fashion. Amoret in flight from Lust leaps "like a roe buck light."¹³⁸ Scudamour holds the hand of Amoret with the shyness of "warie Hynd within the weedie soyle."¹³⁹ The distinctiveness of the similes is a lurking sympathy for the animal in distress, as in these homely, effective lines describing Marin's love of Florimel:

"In this sad plight he walked here and there,
And romed round about the rocke in vaine,
As he had lost himselfe, he wist not where;
Oft listening if he mote her heare againe;
And still bemoaning her unworthy paine.
Like as an Hynde whose calfe is falne unwares
Into some pit, where she him heares complaine,
An hundred times about the pit side fares,
Right sorrowfully mourning her bereaved cares."¹⁴⁰

Spenser fancies the relief of the thirsty hind

"that greedily embayes
In the cool soyle"¹⁴¹

To conclude, Amavia expires

"As gentle Hynd, whose sides with cruell steele
Though launched, forth her bleeding life does raine,
Whiles the sad pang approaching she does feelee,
Brayes out her latest breath, and up her eyes doth seele."¹⁴²

Bears and wolves must have been prowlers familiar to the residents of Kilcolman. The bear obviously suggests greed and ferocity. The wrath of Radigund is like that of a bear that seizes with "cruell claws"

"Upon the carkasse of some beast too weake,
Proudly stands over, and a while doth pause
To hear the piteous beast pleading her plaintiffe cause "¹⁴³

Calidore upon the loss of Pastorello is like a bear whose whelps have been stolen.¹⁴⁴ There is an odd touch in the mention of a bear's "uneven paw." Another figure suggests a scene the English poet might have witnessed, the bear seeking honeycomb and frightened away by dogs.¹⁴⁵ Remembrances of pastimes on the Bankside, possibly fresh Irish experiences, are involved in figures drawn from bear baiting, as in these powerful lines:

"So mightily the British Prince him roudz
Out of his hold, and broke his captive bands,
And as a Beare whom angry cures have touzdz,
Having off-shakt them, and escapt their hands,
Becomes more fell, and all that him withstands
Treads downe and overthrowes "¹⁴⁶

Wolves are mentioned less often, and quite conventionally, but there is a striking simile of the combat of Satyrane and Cambell,

"As when two greedy wolves breake by force
Into an heard far from the husband farm,"¹⁴⁷

paralleled by a passage in the *Iliad*, but lifelike enough to be an incident seen by Spenser or reported by a frightened Munster shepherd.

Spenser's interest in snakes, necessarily only reminiscent of England after 1579, or purely literary, is little concerned with the outward appearance, except in the exquisite simile of elusive beauty of gold so woven into an arras that

"the rich metall lurkēd privily
As faining to be hid from envious eye;

many a predecessor and contemporary. That he may have seen the beast in the Tower is by no means unlikely. (Chaucer himself had such an opportunity.) The numerous similes and metaphors are chiefly too stereotyped for comment. Folk lore continues, as in the case of the noble creature that guards Una until he dies beside her, pierced by the deadly iron brand of Sansloy.¹⁶¹ Rather individual is the comparison of Calidore striking among thieves like a lion "amongst a herd of deer."¹⁶² Likewise, the freezing astonishment of Guyon at sight of slaughtered Mordaunt warms with the power of a "Lyon grudging in his great disdain."¹⁶³ Artegal rousing himself for battle is

"Like as a Lyon that in drowsie cave
Hath long time slept"¹⁶⁴

A lion symbolizes William the Conqueror.¹⁶⁵ The face of "the great dame nature" did like a lion show, too powerful for some eyes, though reported by other beholders as of beauty far surpassing that of the sun.¹⁶⁶ The lion consorts with the lamb, as in *Isaiah*, fights with the unicorn in traditional fashion, and struggles with a tiger in the vivid conflict of Britomart and Radigund.¹⁶⁷

Osgood has remarked Spenser's tiger as exceptionally ferocious,¹⁶⁸ and thus opposed to the lion, "a noble beast."¹⁶⁹ The grief of the Squire of Low Degree is enough to pierce the heart of tigers and bears.¹⁷⁰ Cambell and Diamond fight like "tigers over prey." Britomart and Radigund in combat are like a tiger and a lioness met at "spoyling of some hungry prey."¹⁷¹ The tiger in flight is imaginatively described:

"For as the wingèd wind his Tigre fled,
That view of eye could scarce him overtake,
Ne scarce his feet on ground were seene to tread;
Through hils and dales he speedie way did make,
Ne hedge ne ditch his readie passage brake."¹⁷²

Again, blows of Huddibras and Sansloy against Guyon are like those of a bear and tiger in conflict, a strange pair, according to Upton.¹⁷³ Finally, the tiger pursuing Pastorella has a "greedy mouth," wide-gaping "like hell-gate," a scene that suggests the vanished Scripture play.¹⁷⁴

It is beyond my purpose to discuss conceptions of the

fabulous animals in the *Faerie Queene*. Suffice it to say that Spenser probably knew as much about them as both his unlettered and sophisticated contemporaries.¹⁷⁵ Camleon, basilisk or cockatrice, crocodile, griffin, unicorn, phoenix doubtless fascinated his Elizabethan mind. Philosophy today has clipped the wings not only of angels but of fantastic animal creatures in an age when curiosity may be satisfied in scores of scientifically catalogued zoological gardens. Only a word is needed as to Spenser's fancy for and *monstrous*, words colorless to us but to them vaguely charming and at least slightly concrete. Even love as a "monster fell" connoted more than in modern parlance. Simpler conceptions of the abnormal, giant or "ghastly bug," terrifying forms, may be mentioned, besides the complex, grotesque dragon, Error, and the splendid dragon slain by Redcross as his crowning achievement, the Monster monsters. Like Shakspeare, he is extremely fond of *monster* under the Altar in Book V, and the Blatant Monster of the thousand tongues derived from half a dozen kinds of animals. Much investigation of these creatures and their literary origins has been industriously made and need not be summarized in a paper which concerns animal life only as provocative of figures. I have omitted also the great, fundamental allegorization based on animals, of which the Ape in *Mother Hubbard's Tale* is a most striking symbol.¹⁷⁶ A few final generalizations on animal life may be added, too vague for classification: the "biting sword"; "bite of cursed steel";¹⁷⁷ devouring spear";¹⁷⁸ "bitter byting grief"; "chawing vengeance"; "the untamed heart."

If Spenser sees at times conventionally, comparison with his contemporaries supports him. Their interest in observation differed entirely from the sentimentalizing of animals in our Romantic period. It was much closer to the allegorization of the bestiaries, the days of grotesque gargoyles on cathedrals, and very far from the modern delight in fearful symmetry as sculptured by Paul Bartlett, a Borglum, or Matilda Hoffman. Nevertheless, unreal as much of Elizabethan animal lore was, it implied a closeness to bird and beast which has faded today as a source of metaphor.¹⁷⁹ Surely few poets have so delighted as Spenser in the terrible sight of splendid creatures in action, or perhaps suffered so much at fearsome sounds in lonely wilds,

destined as he was, more than any other great English poet, to a savagely romantic region for the superb accomplishment of a literary life.

*College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Va.*

- 98*Ibid.*, I, 10, 47, 6 99*Ibid.*, III, 7, 10, 9 100*Ibid.*, III, 9, 5, 8.
101*Variorum* I, 288 102*FQ* III, 11, 47, 6-7 103*Ibid.*, II, 3, 6, 3-5
104*Ibid.*, III, 4, 33, 5
For Shakspeare's special interest in the flight of birds, see Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, p. 48
105*FQ*, I, 1, 44, 6-7 106*Ibid.*, II, 8, 5, 8 107*Ibid.*, V, 6, 27, 1-4
108*Ibid.*, VI, 7, 42, 5-6 109*Ibid.*, 1, 4, 21, 5 110*Ibid.*, II, 11, 23, 3
111*Ibid.*, 11, 12, 36 112*Variorum* V, 206 118*FQ*, V, 5, 43, 1-3
114*Ibid.*, V, 5, 52, 1-2.
115Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, (pp 99-100) believes Shakspeare had no specific knowledge of fishing, a strange conclusion in my opinion
116*FQ*, IV, 11, 32, 9 117*Ibid.*, I, 8, 11, 3-9 118*Ibid.*, V, 6, 19, 2
119*Ibid.*, V, 2, 27, 2 120*Ibid.*, VI, 8, 12, 1-5 121*Ibid.*, VII, 6, 28, 7-8
122*Ibid.*, IV, 6, 37, 4-5 123*Ibid.*, II, 8, 42, 1-7
124*Ibid.*, III, 4, 17 See *Variorum* III, 239, for Upton's praise of Spenser's felicity and Z E Green, "Observations on the Epic Similes in the *Faerie Queene*," *Philological Quarterly*, XIV, 3, (July, 1935), p. 224, for praise of the simile as one of the most magnificent figures of speech in the whole poem.
125*FQ* VI, 12, 30, 7-9 126*Oxford Spenser*, p 210 127*FQ* III, 7, 36, 6
128*Ibid.*, I, 5, 10; *Variorum* I, 240, 241
129Perhaps the phrase is not applicable to sheep, and yet may be, possibly suggested by I Peter 1: 19.
130*FQ*, I, 2, 16. See Z E Green, *op cit.*, p. 220, for praise of the simile as well-proportioned.
131*FQ* IV, 3, 41, 4-5.
132*Ibid.*, II, 9, 4, 6-7; V, 4, 44, 7-9; V, 6, 30, 6; VI, 8, 36, 8
133*Ibid.*, I, 8, 35, 5-7. 134*Variorum* III, 286-7, V, 232.
135*FQ*, I, 6, 44, 3-9. 136*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 40, 1-4 137*Ibid.*, III, 7, 1, 1-6
138*Ibid.*, IV, 7, 22, 2. 139*Ibid.*, IV, 10, 55, 8
140*Ibid.*, IV, 12, 17. See *Variorum* IV, 277-8 for Warton's comment.
141*FQ* III, 12, 44, as in the first edition; *Oxford Spenser*, p. 210.
142*Ibid.*, II, 1, 38, 6-9. 143*Ibid.*, V, 4, 40, 6-9 144*Ibid.*, VI, 11, 25, 8-9.
145*Ibid.*, III, 10, 53, 4-9; *Variorum* III, 287.
146*Ibid.*, II, 11, 33, 3-6. 147*Ibid.*, IV, 4, 35, 6-7.
148*Ibid.*, III, 11, 28, 4-9; *Variorum* III, 282, quotes Lowell's enthusiastic comment.
149*FQ*, II, 11, 22, 4 150*Ibid.*, I, 9, 28, 8 151*Ibid.*, IV, 8, 26, 8-9.
152*Ibid.*, II, 5, 34, 1-2 153*Ibid.*, III, 8, 25, 2 154*Ibid.*, II, 4, 33, 5.
155*Ibid.*, III, 11, 1. 156*Ibid.*, III, 2, 15, 5-6 157*Ibid.*, I, 10, 13, 4-6
158*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 42, 1, 6. 159*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 42, 1, 6 160*Ibid.*, IV, 8, 39, 7.
161*Variorum*, I, 207. 162*FQ*, VI, 11, 49, 1-5 163*Ibid.*, II, 1, 42, 6.
164*Ibid.*, III, 3, 30, 1-2 165*Ibid.*, III, 3, 47
166*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 6, 4-9. 167*Ibid.*, V, 7, 30
168*Modern Language Notes*, XLVI, 1933, p 505
169See Winstanley's comment, *Variorum* II, 235.
170*FQ*, IV, 8, 4, 9. 171*Ibid.*, V, 7, 30, 2 172*Ibid.*, II, 11, 26, 1-6.
173*Variorum* II, 198-9 174*FQ* VI, 10, 34, 6.
175See H. W. Seager, *Natural History in Shakespeare's Time* (London, 1896), p. vi, for mention of Batman's *Libre de Proprietatibus*, the leading popular treatise of the day See also Emma Phipson, *Animal Lore of Shakespeare's Time* (1883).
176See A B Lieble, *Conventions of Animal Symbolism in Mother Hubbards Tale*, unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago
177*Variorum* II, 247. Jortin derives this from Libullus, but idea of the bite is Spenser's.
178*Ibid.*, I, 256, gives a source.
179See G L Kittredge, *Words and Their Ways in English Speech* (1908), p. 361-2.

THE TRUE TEXT OF *KING LEAR**

By LEO KIRSCHBAUM

TEXTUAL criticism is not an end in itself. Its purpose is the setting-forth of a given text as the author wished that text set forth. It is not a science but an art. The late R. B. McKerrow put the *caveat* and the *apologia* for textual criticism succinctly in his Preface to *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*:

Indeed, when we sum up the whole matter, we shall, I think, find that the editing of an old text, however much it may call for literary appreciation and imagination, must in the first place be based upon the most careful research into surviving evidence, and that, however much it may depend for its foundations upon that kind of common sense which some would dignify by the name of 'science', it is also, and perhaps in all its finer achievements, of the nature of an art¹

The textual critic employs taste constantly in his operations. Conversely, the textual critic utilizes all the available evidence before he presents his reading for acceptance. What one prefers is beside the point. What is to the point is what a careful study of the texts indicates. Furthermore, in textual criticism there are many methods and many kinds of evidence. At all times, one tries to establish as high a degree of probability as is possible. When one is done, one cannot say: Here is what Shakspeare wrote. One can, at best, say: This is probably what Shakspeare wrote. With these preliminary remarks, I proceed to the problem of the text of *King Lear*.

The two texts which modern scholars employ in their reconstruction of the play as Shakspeare wrote it are the First Quarto of 1608 and the First Folio of 1623. Each omits lines which the other has: Q about 100 lines found in F, and F about 300 lines, including IV. iii, found in Q². The two texts differ constantly in those passages which they have in common—much less than Q₁ and Q₂ of *Hamlet*, much more than Q and F of *Troilus and Cressida*. How puzzling the problem of the two texts is may be illustrated by Kitredge's recent statement:

*This article represents the introductory chapter and two textual analyses from a forthcoming book.

The differences between the Quarto and the Folio by no means warrant the theory that Shakespeare ever re-wrote his *King Lear* or subjected it to a substantial revision.

As for the exact nature of the 'copy' which the printer of the Quarto or the printer of the Folio used, or for its relation, in each case, to the Globe prompt book, nothing short of revelation will ever enlighten us.³

But Greg, in a recent monograph which represents the first serious and sustained attempt to grapple with one category of problems which editing of the play presents, refuses to look at the matter as does Kittredge:

There is no disguising the fact that editors have left the textual criticism of *King Lear* in a thoroughly unsatisfactory state, indeed one is almost tempted to say that no work worth mentioning has hitherto been done on the subject. This is hardly surprising seeing that the necessary apparatus was not available. I believe that now the whole of the information needed is at the disposal of editors, and it appears to be high time that they set about the job of preparing a text of the play that shall be based upon a properly reasoned estimate of the evidence.⁴

The present study, therefore, cannot escape the nature of being an answer to a double challenge. I agree with Greg that the *textus receptus* is highly unsatisfactory. I hope that I can show how we may establish a text which will represent a return to Shakspeare.

Some of the problems in the inquiry appear to be chiefly of bibliographical interest. Yet their solution provides the groundwork of the solution to the textual problem. I shall enlarge upon this later. To begin with, we must recognize that there is no such thing as a quarto text. As so often happened in those days, the sheets of Q were corrected while the book was a-printing. But the uncorrected sheets were not discarded. They were mixed and used indiscriminately with the corrected sheets. Thus, out of the twelve extant copies of Q, some have *this* sheet in corrected state and *that* sheet in uncorrected state. There is this peculiarity, that of a given sheet only one forme has been corrected, either the inner or the outer, never both.⁵ The inner formes of C, F, H and the outer formes of D, E, G, K were corrected and are thus found in two states; sheets B, I, L are invariant in the extant copies of Q. Greg's *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'* contains an admirably thorough dis-

cussion of these different readings. At all times Greg's end is the establishment of the true text.⁶

The whole problem of the editing of *King Lear*, the entire question of the *textus receptus*, hinges on a utilizable solution to the problem of the relationship of Q and F. We have already seen Kittredge's disbelief in a possible solution. Chambers⁷ and Greg,⁸ however, consider Q a bad quarto. Both believe it a shorthand transcript from performance. Doran holds that the "first quarto represents Shakespeare's original manuscript, extensively revised, and that the folio represents a transcript of the original, abridged, somewhat revised, marked by the censor, used in the theater as a prompt-book, and finally used as the master copy by the printers of the First Folio."⁹ Van Dam states that Q is "far superior to the F version," that it "belongs to the class of printed plays nearest to Shakespeare's originals," and that F represents "the revised prompt-book, one remove farther from Shakespeare's original than the prompt-book text which served as copy for the Q."¹⁰

What evidence has been offered that Q is a reported text, a bad quarto? Chambers writes:

The texts are substantially derived from the same original. There are a good many verbal variants . . . Q seems to contain some 'connective' phrases by actors, and many of its misreadings might well be due either to actors' blunders or to mishearing . . . Mislineation is a constant feature in Q . . . Occasionally it is altogether unmetrical. Prose is printed as verse. Still more often is verse printed as prose . . . Moreover, Q has practically no punctuation except commas, even in places where both logic and enunciation require heavier stops and these are supplied by F. I think that the characteristics of Q point to a reported text. It is, of course, a much better version than the bad Quartos of 2, 3 *Henry VI*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V*, *Merry Wives*, and *Hamlet*. In particular it does not displace bits of dialogue within a scene, or bring in bits from other scenes or other plays. Possibly it was produced by shorthand and not memorization. The reporter, except for subconscious substitutions by himself or the actors, has not got his words badly. The failure is in putting his continuous notes into metre, and in punctuating them. And these tasks he seems to have largely shirked . . .

Apart from iii. 2. 79-95, most of the Q omissions might well be errors. They leave *lacunae* of sense or action at i. 1. 41-6, i. 2.

118-24, ii. 4. 142-7, iv. 1. 6-9, iv. 6. 169-74. In a reported text, actors, reporter, and printer may all have contributed. Identical line-ends have led to mistakes at i. 1. 90 and iii. 4. 18. Probably the reporter's lapses of attention are mainly responsible, and some linked omissions (ii. 4. 99-100, 104; iii. 4. 26-7, 37-8) and small contextual alterations suggest that he was sometimes aware of these, and attempted to cover them up. On the other hand, there is some political and social criticism in the play, and it is conceivable that the omission of i. 2. 118-24 and iv. 6. 169-74 and also of iii. 1. 22-9 may have been directed by a censor¹¹

I now quote Greg's analysis of the Q-F relationship in his well-known article, "The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of *King Lear*":

The main features of the Quarto text appear to be as follows: in outward form, misrepresentation of the metrical structure, and defective and misleading punctuation; textually, constant redundancy of expression, and persistent substitution of another (and generally inferior) reading for that of the Folio.

To pass to textual features: by redundancy I understand the expansion and dilution of the text, on the one hand by the introduction of exclamations, expletives, vocatives, and connective words generally, on the other hand by the use of looser and less close-knit phrasing. Such redundancy is characteristic of actors and is a marked feature of reported texts.

Both forms of redundancy are united in this typical example (I. i. 70-1):

F I am made of that selfe-mettle as my Sister,

Q Sir I am made of the selfe same mettall that my sister is, . . . Or, for flabby and vicious phrasing, take (II. iv. 225):

F Or rather a disease that's in my flesh,

Q Or rather a disease that lies within my flesh, and for the intrusion of connective phrases (I. iv. 332-3):

F *Lear* . . . Thou shalt finde,

That Ile resume the shape which thou dost thinke

I haue cast off for euer [*Q*, thou shalt I warrant thee]

Gon. Do you marke that [*Q* my Lord]?

In all these cases the Quarto is condemned by the verse. Moreover, these connectives tend to be borrowed or repeated from other passages, such assimilation being another common trick of actors. In the first scene Lear twice admonishes Cordelia (I. i. 92, 96)

Nothing will come of nothing, speake againe
and later:

How, how *Cordelia*? Mend your speech a little, . . .

The Quarto borrows "How" from the second to prefix unmetrically to the first, and gives the second in the form:

Goe to, goe to, mend your speech a little, introducing a fretful exclamation, more in the style of Polonius Folio has "Away, away" (I. iv. 294, 311); and while in the Folio than of Lear, which it employs again unmetrically later on. Similarly the Quarto makes Lear conclude two consecutive speeches with the words "goe, goe, my people", whereas in the second case the Lear cries once "Yet haue I left a daughter," and later, "I haue another daughter", the Quarto uses the first phrase on both occasions (I, 276, 327). There are also some traces of actors' exaggerations and bombast

The reporter reveals his presence by a number of mistakes of hearing, such as "a dogge, so bade in office" for "a Dogg's obey'd in Office" (IV. vi. 163), and

striuing to better ought, we marre whats well
instead of

striuing to better, oft we marre what's well,
which is puzzling till we remember that Shakespeare rimes *oft* and *nought* (I. iv. 369) . . . Further traces of the reporter are a number of speeches assigned to the wrong character, and sometimes modified to suit. For instance, where in the Folio Regan says to Edmund (V. iii. 81):

Let the Drum strike, and proue my title thine
in the Quarto it is Edmund himself who says.

Let the drum strike, and proue my title good
as if a drum could prove anything but its power of making a noise. It is also significant that inarticulate sounds and meaningless refrains indicated in the Folio, are in the Quarto either omitted (I. ii. 149, III. iv. 59, IV. vi. 207) or quite otherwise expressed, as when "Do, de, de, de· sese" becomes "loudla doodla" (III. vi. 77).

But it is the verbal variants of the two texts that supply the most ample evidence of reporting. Such changes must inevitably occur on the stage, and the substituted word will be either indifferent or generally inferior. That this is what we observe in the Quarto text is agreed, but Miss Doran points out, pertinently enough, that indifferent variants may be the unconscious substitutions of a compositor or a copyist, while superior Folio readings may be due to revision. Now, theoretically this is perhaps a sufficient answer, but when we come to examine actual examples I think that it breaks down in practice. For one thing, the indifferent, or nearly indifferent, variants are rather numerous to father upon one transcriber and two compositors, for another, some superficially indifferent variants prove to be in fact due to repetition and thus suggest actors' assimilations; and lastly some are not isolated but consciously linked. When, in the line (I. i. 186):

That iustly think'st, and hast most rightly said:
the Quarto transposes the words "iustly" and "rightly", the blunder is perhaps not beyond the range of original sin latent in a copyist.

but when, two lines apart, we find "Foue dayes . . . And on the sixt," consistently varied to "Foure" and "fift", this explanation becomes less satisfactory. (I. i. 176, 178). And so it is with revision. There may be cases—many cases—in which it is impossible to distinguish between corruption on the one hand or revision on the other. But I question whether this is always, or even generally, so. Where one reading is metrical and the other not; where in one the thought receives natural expression, in the other forced or inept; or where one shows a misunderstanding of the sense that is clear in the other, we have, I think, good and sufficient ground for judging.

To set forth the evidence in detail would need no less than a complete textual commentary on the play I can do no more than select an example here and there from the cloud of witnesses. Here is a passage condemned by the metre. The Folio reads (I. ii. 10).

Why brand they vs

With Base? With basenes Bastardie? Base, Base?

The verse is correct, but the second is not an easy line to remember exactly, and it is hardly surprising to find in the Quarto no more than the unmetrical syncopation

with base, base bastardie?

At one point Oswald says of Gloucester (IV. v. 40):

Would I could meet [him] Madam, I should shew

What party I do follow.

The Quarto reads "What Lady I doe follow", and since the talk has been of the rivalry between Regan and Goneril this would come naturally to the lips of an actor, but it is not to that that the Steward is referring. Or consider the lines in which Lear breaks forth in true Shakspearian phrase (III. ii. 58):

Close pent-vp guilts,

Riue your concealing Continents, and cry

These dreadfull Summoners grace.

The Quarto's "riue your concealed centers" makes neither verse nor sense. Once more: Regan observes, shrewdly enough, of the blinded Gloucester (IV. v. 10):

Where he arriues, he moues

All hearts against vs: *Edmund*, I thinke is gone

In pittie, of his misery, to dispatch

His nighted life: Moreouer to descry

The strength o' th' Enemy.

When, in place of "*Edmund*", the Quarto reads "and now", it makes the following lines refer to Gloucester, which, remembering his attempted suicide in the next scene, might appear not unreasonable to an actor who overlooked the fact that it further credits the corpse with the purpose of spying on the French army! Failure of memory alone can account for a final example (I. i. 85-7.). When in the first scene Lear at last turns to Cordelia, he addresses her in the tender words:

Now our Ioy,
 Although our last and least, to whose yong loue
 The Vines of France, the Milke of Burgundie,
 Striue to be interest.
 In place of this the Quarto has only·

but now our Ioy,
 Although the last, not least in our deere loue,
 where it is surely the loss of a line and a half that has occasioned
 the reconstruction. If anybody can see revision in this passage his
 conception of poetical composition must be radically different from
 my own. . . .

Miss Doran has argued that the Quarto text is far too good to
 be reported, and she is able to point with considerable force to the
 very different textual conditions found in admittedly reported texts,
 such as the earliest print of *Romeo and Juliet*. But I think that
 it is now agreed by most critics that these are what are called
 memorial reconstructions. This the quarto of *Lear* emphatically is
 not. If it is indeed a reported text it must have been taken down
 by shorthand. . . .¹²

Greg's well-known essay was a trail-blazing one. It may
 be said to be the first real attempt to deal with the problem
 of editing the play. However, has not Greg hampered his
 own inquiries and those of other interested scholars? On
 the one hand, he points out the following kinds of mnemonic
 error in Q: repetition, addition, assimilation, anticipation,
 recollection, mishearing, wrong ascription, transposition, sub-
 stitution, misunderstanding, telescoping, restatement, etc.
 On the other hand, he insists that Q is not a memorial re-
 construction. What prevents Greg from doing with parallel
 Q-F what he did so superbly with *Orlando Furioso* and
 Orlando's extant part in his *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridge-
 ments*.¹³ To indicate that Q contains constant examples of
 faulty memory and then to hamstring the inquiry because
 of a hypothesis for provenance (i.e., shorthand) seems to
 me wrong. To hold that Q stems from performance is to
 give it a quasi-authority which it certainly does not possess.
 Before any hypotheses concerning origin are raised, a full
 explanation of the bad memory hypothesis is obviously in-
 dicated. The deterrent so far has been, it would seem, that
 Q is not as outrageously apparent a memorial corruption
 as the bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*. Yet Greg himself
 has stated that the latter has passages "that are at least as
 good as any in the quarto of *Lear*."¹⁴ Furthermore, although
 the Q-F relationship of *Richard III* is, as Patrick has
 pointed out,¹⁵ one of memorial corruption, the quarto of

this play is, *apparently*, better than the quarto of *King Lear*! It seems worthwhile to show in some detail in the present study that Q is a constant memorial corruption of the text of F. If I can show that this is so, then editors of *King Lear* will at last have a distinction made between a text with authority and a text without authority.

But the superior authority of F can be satisfactorily established on grounds other than textual comparison. This is surprising—but it is true. That F was printed from a copy of Q which had been emended by reference to a transcript is bibliographically demonstrable.¹⁶ The 1623 Folio being what it is, the conclusion is inescapable that this transcript derived from Shakspeare's fellows. Hence, as Greg has pointed out, when Q and F agree, there is less warrant for the reading than when they differ, for there may be concurrence of error.¹⁷ But much more of this point should be made than Greg has made. In fact, it is right to say that the whole editorial policy toward the text of *King Lear* might rest on this bibliographical relationship between F and Q. It must be reiterated again and again—until every editor of Shakspeare takes note—that when F differs from Q, someone has made a deliberate change on a leaf of Q; that this someone was connected with Shakspeare's company,¹⁸ that he must have made the change by reference to a manuscript ultimately deriving from Shakspeare himself; that this someone scrupulously adhered to this manuscript if the hundreds of changes, small and great, which he made on Q's leaves are taken into account.¹⁹ When one sees this unknown again and again substituting for the Q word a word which is not *obviously better*, which on the basis of taste may be considered worse, one gets a clear and true picture of this unknown's integrity. Truly, we owe a great debt to him. And our respect for Heminge and CondeU tends correspondingly to increase.

Someone with authority purposefully changed Q by reference to a playhouse manuscript. One wonders how future editors of *King Lear* can be as careless and carefree in their reliance on Q as past editors have been. That Q's corruption can be demonstrated need not *necessarily*, as I have suggested, enter into the matter. That F changes Q, that behind these changes looms Shakspeare himself, should be

enough of a warning to the editor who hankers for a Q reading as over against a F reading. What this editor is doing, in short, is preferring a reading which someone with authority of the King's Men, using a transcript going directly back to Shakspeare, has rejected. In a way, therefore, it is fortunate that F's text is the result of a quasi-palimpsest. The differences between Q and F are thus seen to be dynamically purposive. Where the two texts differ, the F reading *must* be adopted by editors.²⁰ But this editorial principle does not rob the scholar of all the leeway he wishes in his treatment of the text where Q and F agree.²¹ There may be common error. Such passages should represent a challenge to the textual critic just as much as those passages in Q which are not present in F.

But the attack on Q is a double one. When Shakspeare's complete plays came to be printed, Q was used as 'copy' *after* it had been changed by reference to a manuscript with authority. Q can also be shown to be a memorial perversion of the text in this manuscript—as represented by F. My analyses of parallel passages from Q and F will, I hope, convince the interested scholar that Q is a memorial reconstruction. A certain psychological by-play has undoubtedly entered into the past editorial attitude toward Q. Because there is a good text in the light of which the bad text can be interpreted, the bad text has unconsciously assumed a degree of clarity and aptness which it undoubtedly does not possess. If the perception is rid of the presence of F, Q stands forth as a text obviously corrupt. What my examination of Q has taught me is that this text is thoroughly undependable. Its corruption is not merely a matter of mislineation, wrong punctuation, or no punctuation. Any recto or verso of Q will have opacity elbowing ineptness. Q inadvertently omits. Q has a word or line before or after where it belongs. Anticipation or recollection causes assimilation of similar lines in different passages. Q vulgarizes. Q adds unnecessary words. Q substitutes the well-worn phrase for the Shakspearean phrase. Q misunderstands the meaning of lines. Q misunderstands and misinterprets the action. Q spoils fine touches of characterization. Q does not know who the speaker is and guesses. Q runs together two different speakers' lines. Q, in short, stands solidly in the way of Shakspeare.

It is reasonable to be concerned about the present text of *King Lear*. It is surely unreasonable to levy charges against the editors who have made it what it is. They have tended to recognize F as the more authoritative text, but taste has been their sole criterion. There are, according to Greg, nearly four hundred Q readings, apart from passages preserved only in Q, in the Globe text.²² But this numeration does not tell the whole story, for the modern text, depending consciously or unconsciously on Q, interferes—as I shall try to show—with Shakspere's characterization and action. Modern editors follow, for the most part, Clark and Wright's text. One purpose of the present monograph is to indicate that the onus of proof must always rest with the defender of the Q reading. The authority behind Q is a reporter's memory. I hope to show how modern editors have introduced the corruption of Q into the *textus receptus*.

The rest of this study is concerned with analysis of Q as a memorial reconstruction and a consideration of modern editors in the light of this analysis. My basic text has been Victor's parallel text of F and Q.²³ I have corrected the Q text of this by reference to Greg's list of errors in the Praetorius facsimile²⁴ which Victor used and by the collotype facsimile of the Gorhambury copy recently published by the Shakespeare Association.²⁵ The F text has been checked by reference to the facsimile edited by Dover Wilson.²⁶ All the passages but three are from places where Q is invariant and where there is a corresponding passage in F. Two passages are given to indicate how Q can be emended where there is no corresponding passage in F. Only one passage invades the territory which Greg has so well covered in *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, and this passage is given mainly for purposes of illustration. All the passages I have selected are, I believe, representative of Q as a whole.

After each parallel passage has been analyzed, I try to show what modern editors have done with the passage by citing three representative editions of *King Lear* which cover the past eighty years: *The Globe Edition* of 1865,²⁷ *The Arden edition* of 1901²⁸ and the *Kittredge* edition of 1940.²⁹ All other editorial procedure and comment are de-

rived, under the lines being discussed, from Furness's *Variorum Edition*.⁸⁰

The procedure, therefore, is (A) presentation of texts, (B) comparison of texts, (C) comment upon accepted editorial usage. Act, scene, and line numbering according to nature of the Q leaf at the head of the Q passage. If F the *Globe* is indicated at the head of the F passage, the sig-lacks the passage, act, scene, and line numbering is given at the head of the Q passage.

A. F (I. i. 151-3)

reserve thy state,
And in thy best consideration checke
This hideous rashness,

Q (B 3 r)

Reverse thy doome, and in thy best consideration
Checke this hideous rashness,

B. F's "reserue thy state", spoken by Kent to Lear, becomes "Reverse thy doome" in Q's 151. This is a memorial anticipation of Q's version, "Revoke thy doom" of F 167's "reuoake thy guift", also spoken by Kent to the King. The reporter's memory was, perhaps, not uninfluenced by recollection of similar conventional phraseology in other Shakespeare plays: 'Reuoake that doom of mercy', *III Henry VII*, II. vi. 46; "reverse the doom of death," *Timon of Athens*, II. iii. 42, "reverse a prince's doom," *Romeo and Juliet*, III. iii. 59. It is significant that Kent in both places in F refers to Lear's abdication, whereas in Q in both places he is made to refer to Cordelia. F's text is infinitely richer and more complex than Q's. How prescient of the events to come are Kent's two short objurgations in F, for the whole tragedy springs from Lear's abdication in Favor of Goneril and Regan! In F, Kent is shown to be concerned not only with Cordelia but with Lear. His regard for his master foreshadows his devotion in the coming scenes. In "reserue thy state" F 151, Kent is concerned with Lear, in F 154-6, with Cordelia, in "reuoake thy gift" F 167, with Lear. In Q, on the other hand, in all three places Kent is concerned only with Cordelia! Furness furnishes us with further evidence against Q's "Reuerse thy doome" in his defence of F's "reserue thy state": "When Lear has been turned out of doors and his daughters have usurped all his powers, Gloucester (III, iv, 156) says, 'Ah that good Kent! He said it would be thus,' which cannot well refer to any other passage than the present." But Q's text is safely indicted on the score of memorial contamination. And we have here a good example of how editorial dependence on Q can vitiate Shakespeare.

C. *Globe* and *Kittredge* follow Q for 151; *Arden* follows F. I add that *Globe* and *Arden* have Q's "Reuoake thy doom" for 167,

while *Kittredge* has F's "reuoake thy guift" Thus *Globe* follows Q for 151 and 167; *Arden* follows F for 151 but Q for 167; *Kittredge* follows Q for 151 but F for 167. Such is the consistency of editors!

A. F (I. iv. 106-119)

Foole. Let me hire him too, here's my Coxcombe.

Lear. How now my pretty knaue, how dost thou?

Foole. Sirrah, you were best take my Coxcombe.

Lear. Why my Boy?

Foole. Why? for taking ones part that's out of fauor, nay, & thou canst not smile as the wind sits, thou'lt catch colde shortly, there take my Coxcombe, why this fellow ha's banish'd two on's Daughters, and did the third a blessing against his will, if thou follow him, thou must needs weare my Coxcombe. How now Nunckle? would I had two Coxcombes and two Daughters.

Lear. Why my boy?

Q (C4v)

Foole. Let me hire him too, heer's my coxcombe

Lear. How now my pretty knaue, how do'st thou?

Foole. Sirra, you were best take my coxcombe

Kent. Why Foole?

Foole. Why for taking on's part, that's out of fauour, nay and thou can'st not smile as the wind sits, thou't catch cold shortly, there take my coxcombe; why this fellow hath banisht two on's daughters, and done the third a blessing against his will, if thou follow him, thou must needs weare my coxcombe, how now nuncle, would I had two coxcombes, and two daughters

Lear. Why my Boy?

B. Q takes 110 from Lear and gives it to Kent in the form, "Why Foole?" The Q line and ascription appear to be a memorial anticipation of II. iv. 68: "*Kent.* Why Foole?" The context in the latter passage and in the present passage are strikingly similar: in the latter, the Fool makes a short ambiguous statement, Kent asks his question, and the Fool's answer makes oblique reflection on Kent's imprudence in following one who is out of favor: "let go thy hold when a great wheele runs downe a hill, least it break thy neck with following". Kent's speech thirty lines later at F I iv 141. "This is nothing Foole", may possibly have also been a disturbing factor. Another possible reason for Q's bungling is that Lear has exactly the same speech at 110 and at 119. Editors who are misled by Q and follow it at 110 miss Shakspeare's intention: the wily Fool pays no attention to Lear, in spite of the latter's questions, recognizes only Kent, and says to the latter what he wants the King to hear. He *apparently* is talking to Kent but is *really* talking to Lear. Part of the game is for Kent to remain silent. If 110 is given to Kent, this intention is obscured. Note

the minor changes which illustrate the F emender's care. Q substitutes "hath" for "ha's" and "done" for "did" in 114

C. *Globe*, *Arden*, and *Kittredge* follow Q's "Kent. Why Foole?" for 110. All three follow F for "did" in 114. *Kittredge* adopts Q's "hath" the other two editions have F's "has". Editorial inconsistency is revealed by the fact that although F's I iv. 141: "Kent. This is nothing Foole" is given to Lear in Q, none of the three editions follow Q here in its ascription! Malone, Stevens, *Third Variorum*, Collier, and Staunton did, however, and thus obscured one of Shakespeare's subtle touches. I quote White "It should be observed, that in addressing this poor, faithful follower, the king never calls him Fool. In speaking of him, he gives him his official title, but in speaking to him, he always uses some term of familiar and pitiful endearment,—generally 'my boy' . . ."

St. Louis University.

¹Oxford University Press, 1935, p. ix

²E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems* (Oxford University Press, 1930), I, 466.

³In the Introduction to the individual edition of *King Lear* (Boston, 1940), p. viii

⁴*The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear', A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry*, Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 15 (Oxford University Press 1940) p. 190.

⁵With one exception. The catchword on K 4 recto was changed to agree with the corrected first word on verso.

⁶Scholars are apt to be bewildered by Greg's assumption that F is authoritative and that Q is corrupt if they have not previously read his article in *Neophilologus*, for which see Footnote 8 below.

⁷*William Shakespeare*, I, 465-6.

⁸"The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of 'King Lear,'" *Neophilologus*, XVIII (1933), 253, 256-7; "King Lear—Mislineation and Stenography," *Library*, XVII (1936-7), 172-83; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, pp. 138, 187.

⁹*The Text of 'King Lear'*, Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, IV, 2 (1931), 137.

¹⁰*The Text of Shakespeare's 'Lear'*, Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, X (1935), 79.

¹¹*William Shakespeare*, I, 465-7

¹²*Op cit.*, pp. 253-6

¹³Oxford University Press, 1923.

¹⁴*The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, p. 138 footnote.

¹⁵*The Textual History of 'Richard III'*, Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, VI, I, (1936).

¹⁶P. A. Daniel was the first to point this out in 1885 in his introduction to the Praetorius facsimile of the first quarto (Shakespeare—Quarto Facsimiles, No. 33, pp. xvi-xx). Chambers in 1930 agreed (*William Shakespeare*, I, 165, 465). Greg has revived and added to Daniel's argument in the *Neophilologus* article (pp. 257-61) and in *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'* (pp. 139-49, *passim*). The folio text of *King Lear* does not stand in a class by itself: two other quartos were substantially emended by reference to an independent MS. before serving as copy for Jaggard, *Richard III* and *Troilus and Cressida* (Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 165).

¹⁷"The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of *King Lear*", pp. 261-2; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, p. 187.

¹⁸The least authority we must give him is that he was delegated by Shakspeare's company.

¹⁹This is not to say that he did not make errors. We know that he did (a) when F reproduces an error in an uncorrected sheet of Q which was rectified in the corrected sheet (see Greg, *Variants*, pp. 180-1, and (b) when in passages where Q is invariant, the two texts have common error, as in "*Historica*" (for "*Histerica*") at II iv 57 and Q "him" F "Hym" (for Lym) at III. vi 72. My impression, for what it is worth, is that the emender was the very opposite of careless. Greg in the pages cited above finds only seven examples of "the folio editor having inadvertently overlooked an error in the uncorrected sheet upon which he was working." Yet of these seven, only one is a sure example. Six are debatable. One at least can be attributed to a careless F compositor.

²⁰Except, of course, where there are strong grounds for believing that the F change represents an error. For example, the emender may have misread his MS. (Doran, "*The Text of 'King Lear'*", pp. 91-5, *passim*, but see Greg, "*The Function of Bibliography, etc.*", pp. 260-1); the F compositor may have misread or misunderstood the emender (Daniel *op. cit.*, p. xx concerning I. i. 112); the F compositor may have made a mechanical error and corrected it by guesswork (Greg, "*The Function of Bibliography, etc.*", pp. 260-1 concerning II. ii. 84); the F compositor or emender may have introduced a sophistication (Greg, *Variants*, pp. 155-6 concerning II. i. 102). One can and must make generalizations concerning Q and F, yet one must regard each variant as a problem in itself. Greg's recent book on the variants of Q is a splendid illustration of this attitude.

²¹The editor, however, should take into consideration the imponderable of the emender's scrupulousness in the differing passages.

²²"The Function of Bibliography, etc.", p. 262.

²³"*King Lear*," *Parallel Texts of the First Quarto and the First Folio*, Shakespeare Reprints, I, ed. Wilhelm Viëtor, Marburg, 1937 (3rd ed.).

²⁴*Variants*, pp. 59-6.

²⁵"*King Lear*", 1608 (*Pide Bull Quarto*), Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 1, London, 1939.

²⁶London, 1931.

²⁷*The Works of William Shakespeare*, The Globe Edition, ed. W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, Cambridge and London, 1865. This follows the Cambridge Edition, of which Vol. VIII containing *King Lear* was published in 1866.

²⁸*The Tragedy of King Lear*, The Arden Edition, ed. W. J. Craig, London, 1915 (2nd ed.).

²⁹*The Tragedy of King Lear*, ed. G. L. Kittredge, Boston, 1940.

³⁰*King Lear*, A New Variorum Edition, Vol. V, ed. H. H. Furness, Philadelphia, 1880.

A NOTE ON WILSON'S *HAMLET*

By N. B. ALLEN

WHEN J. Dover Wilson first published *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of its Transmission*, many students of Shakspeare scholarship were filled with admiration for the immensity, the careful organization, and the completeness of the work. This admiration, however, did not prevent some of these students from feeling a pang at the way in which Wilson threw into the discard certain readings which had always seemed to them inevitable. The sufferers assumed, of course, that nothing could be done to allay their suffering. Wilson had explained in his preface why his precise methods must supersede the haphazard ways of former editors, who merely chose from the second quarto and from the Folio the readings they happened to prefer. Wilson called their procedure "ladling butter from alternate tubs of unknown manufacture" (p. 9). In order to avoid their errors, Wilson had studied the two texts for years. By a careful examination of the incontrovertible errors to be found in each of them, he had discovered the cause of these errors and had classified them as an aid to ascertaining which of the two texts was to be preferred in cases where the reading of neither was obviously wrong. The care and industry and learning Wilson displayed were overwhelming. If he wanted to change the lines readers had always loved, they would simply have to let him do it. It was enough to make us wish we had lived in the nineteenth century.

A more careful study of certain of Wilson's readings is, however, a source of reviving hope. It is a relief to find that, even though Wilson's work is in many ways sound, we shall not find it necessary to accept all his conclusions.

The failure of Wilson's carefully organized study always to secure good results has two causes. In the first place, many of the links in his chain of reasoning are pure conjecture. He has worked out the history of the manuscripts back of the two texts to his own satisfaction, but the structure of assumption is scaffolded by too few unassailable

facts. As Professor Kittredge puts it, "... nothing short of revelation can ever solve such problems beyond dispute."¹ In the second place, even though we accept this part of Wilson's work, even though we may believe he has reconstructed the history of the manuscripts correctly, it does not follow that this enables him to choose the correct readings. It is true that the errors of Q₂ are often different in kind from those of F₁, but when Q₂ and F₁ disagree it usually develops that either may be proved wrong by Wilson's methods. The result is that it is just as difficult for Wilson to decide which cause of error operated in the case in question as it was for the old editors to make their "haphazard" choices.

Let us consider, for instance, Wilson's reading for *Hamlet*, I, 5, 32-34:

"And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
That rots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
Wouldst thou not stir in this . . ."

Rots in line 33 is the F₁ reading, which Wilson prefers to *roots* of Q₂ in spite of the fact that Q₂ is here supported by Q₁. Before discussing the arguments that Wilson draws from his postulated history of the texts, it will perhaps be well to consider briefly why the Q₂ variant has been preferred by most pre-Wilson editors. Though they have not for the most part explained their choice, their reasons must have been something like the following: The Q₂ *roots* is consonant with the sense of the preceding lines spoken by Hamlet. Let us consider the two speeches together, this time choosing the Q₂ variant:

Hamlet: Haste me to know't, that I, with wings as swift
As meditation, or the thoughts of love,
May sweep to my revenge.

Ghost: I find thee apt,
And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
That roots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
Wouldst thou not stir in this . . .

The ghost is carrying out Hamlet's figure. A fat weed *rooted* in the bank² is in excellent contrast with an aroused person *sweeping* as if on wings to violent activity. Complete motionlessness is commonly expressed by the phrase "rooted to the spot," and the Ghost shows that he has not

forgotten Hamlet's figure of speech by his final words, "Wouldst thou not *stir* in this." The word *fat*, too, lends support to the quarto reading; for a weed's roots not only make it inactive, but also allow it to feed and grow fat.⁸

To balance this argument, Wilson has only what he calls "a close parallel" from *Antony and Cleopatra*, I, 4, 45-47:

"Like to a vagabond flag upon the stream,
Goes to and back, lackeying the varying tide,
To rot itself with motion."

Thus far, it seems to me, Wilson's reading has come out badly. As yet, however, we have considered only the probable meaning of the passage, and Wilson's work is largely devoted to textual considerations. What light does his decided against the Q2 variant, it will perhaps be well to look first at his opinion about what were the causes of error in Q2. Even though he considers Q2 in general "the text entitled to preference,"⁴ Wilson has found so many things wrong with it that it has required a rather elaborate theory to account for them all.

Q2 was, according to Wilson, set up from Shakspeare's autograph manuscript, and Shakspeare's handwriting was difficult to read, not only because he was careless in forming tory of the texts throw on the problem? Since Wilson has minim-letters and in distinguishing between *r* and *n*, *d* and *e*, and *o* and *a*,⁵ but also because he was, like every "gentleman"⁶ of his day, a bad speller.⁷ Moreover, the compositor of Q2 was in an unusual hurry, being driven to exceed his proper speed of work in setting up a very difficult manuscript (p. 95). Furthermore, it was particularly difficult for this compositor to hurry, since he was a plodder. He seems to have been so slow, in fact, that Wilson supposes him to have been "a learner or a young journeyman." Finally, there was a press corrector, who, even when he found the word Shakspeare intended in type, sometimes changed it because he didn't understand it.⁸ In the present case Wilson blames the compositor. This man, says Wilson, found *rots* in Shakspeare's manuscript, but could not make it out and turned to Q1 for help. There he found the pirate's *roots*. This explains why Q1 and Q2 agree.⁹

The claim was made above, however, that when Q2 and

F₁ disagree it usually develops that either may be proved wrong by Wilson's methods. Here is an opportunity to test that statement. Let us see what line of reasoning Wilson might have followed had he happened to prefer the Q₂ reading. In that case, his postulated history of F₁ would have furnished him material for argument.

The Folio *Hamlet* is, according to Wilson, one of the most corrupt texts of the whole Shaksperian corpus (p. 43). It abounds in vulgarizations introduced into the text by the maker of the prompt-copy from which it was derived. Wilson calls him Scribe P. This man had considerable dramatic sense, but he was "conventional, downright, a little crude" (p. 26), and he often changed Shakspeare's lines because he failed to understand the idea Shakspeare was developing (pp. 48-50 and 68-70). He also had the same difficulty with Shakspeare's handwriting that the compositor of Q₂ had.

Some of the errors in F₁, however, are due, not to Scribe P, but to another scribe, a "slovenly fellow" who made a copy of the prompt book for Hemming and Condell when they started to publish. Wilson calls this second copyist Scribe C. He was outrageously careless, says Wilson, for he knew that his work would never be given the test of theatrical representation, and he thought there was little likelihood of his being brought to account for slovenliness in a text two-thirds of the way through a volume embracing the whole of Shakspeare's plays (p. 65).

If he had chosen to discredit the F₁ reading, Wilson would have made use of both his postulated scribes. First, however, he would no doubt have returned to Q₂ and referred to his theory that it was based on Shakspeare's autograph manuscript and should therefore in doubtful cases be preferred to F₁. Then he would have pointed out that Q₂ is here supported by Q₁. At first this fact would seem to have no significance in view of the theory of Wilson mentioned above, that, while setting up Act 1, the compositor of Q₂ consulted Q₁ when he came to a word that was hard to read. Wilson uses that theory, however, in connection with "bad" Q₂ readings. When he comes to a "good" Q₂ reading, that is, one that he likes, he argues

that the identity of Q₁ gives him support. For, he says in connection with another word, the presence of the reading in Q₁ "makes it tolerably certain" that it was spoken on the stage and therefore appeared in the original prompt-book.¹⁰ In other words, Q₁ reveals to us that Scribe P agreed with the compositor of Q₂ and that it was Scribe C, the slovenly fellow, who made the "error" and brought the "bad" reading into the Folio. To be specific, if Wilson had liked the Q₂ *roots*, he might have argued that Shakspeare wrote *roots* and that the word successfully got over the hurdles between Shakspeare and Q₂; that Scribe P retained *roots* in the prompt-book; that the reporter of Q₁ therefore heard *roots*; but that, unfortunately for the Folio, Scribe C carelessly made it *rots*.

Wilson might even have explained how Scribe C happened to make the error. Many of this man's changes in the text show him, according to Wilson, to have been well acquainted with *Hamlet*, so well acquainted that we may suppose him to have belonged to the Globe theatre (p. 65). Scribe C reveals this knowledge of *Hamlet* by introducing into the text words from earlier and later parts of the play. Here he wrote *rots* because he had in his mind Marcellus' speech of I, 4, 90

"Something is rotten in the state of Denmark"

or Hamlet's question to the grave digger (V, 1, 178-9),

"How long will a man lie i' the earth
ere he rot?"

This seems far fetched, but I think I am being fair. Consider, for instance, the following examples Wilson gives of mistakes caused by Scribe C's familiarity with the whole play. He argues that Scribe C wrote "drift of conference" (III, 1, 1) as "drift of circumstance" because he remembered "encompasment and drift of question" from Polonius' words to Reynaldo in II, 1, 10, and Hamlet's use of the word "circumstance" in I, 5, 127 (pp. 62-63). Wilson also gives an example of how Scribe C introduced into IV, 4, 3, a word from V, 2, 401 (p. 59). As Wilson says elsewhere, Scribe C is "capable of anything."¹¹

Wilson's reading for I, 2, 129-130 is:

"O that this too too sullied flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew."

Sullied in line 129 is an emendation of the Q2 *sallied*. This emendation Wilson prefers to the more commonly accepted *solid* of F1, his chief argument in favor of the Q2 variant being that it is supported by Q1, which gives us

"O that this too much griev'd and sallied flesh,
Would melt to nothing."

"Griev'd and sallied," says Wilson, proves "incontestably" that "the word which the Q1 reporter heard on the stage and carried away in his memory was not *solid* but a past participle" (p. 309). Wilson's changes of heart about the reporter are strange. If he had merely observed that the reporter *might* be right at times, no one would object. But now he considers him more trustworthy that the scribe who, he supposes, wrote out the copy of the Folio *Hamlet* for Hemming and Condell, Scribe C. In fact, after praising the reporter for his "helpful gloss" which shows us that he had "grasped the meaning of the passage," Wilson calls Scribe C a "slovenly fellow who probably lacked here even the excuse of a difficult or illegible word."¹²

If Wilson had not been already too much carried away by his liking for the *sullied* reading¹³ to judge this part of the case on its merits, he would have remembered that the reporter of Q1 usually did not have clear impressions of the lines he had heard; that in many places he gives us a jumble of words which miss or even reverse Shakspeare's meaning.¹⁴ Such a reporter might give us almost any combination of forms.¹⁵

The situation was the same as it was in the case of *roots* and *rots*, though Wilson's reaction to it was different. Wilson's study of the texts gave him ammunition to use for or against either variant. He chose to defend Q2 because he felt that *sullied* fitted into the context better than *solid* and then, to justify himself, explained that the support of Q1 was significant, while the variance of F1 was not. It is hardly necessary to add that if Wilson had preferred to defend the F1 reading he could have done so. In fact, he could have brought forth exactly the same argument he used in the *roots-rots* case: Shakspeare wrote *solid*, but the compositor of Q2 turned to Q1 for aid in making out a carelessly written word and was led astray by the Q1 error.¹⁶

Wilson's real reasons for choosing the Q2 variant, then, rest on æsthetic and dramatic considerations, just as did those of the older editors. He likes *sullied* because he mother's incest. He feels that the word in conjunction with "melt-thaw-dew" shows that "Hamlet is thinking of snow begrimed with soot and dirt as it often is in melting, and wishing that his 'sullied flesh' might melt as snow melts in time of thaw." The weakness of this argument lies in the fact that elsewhere in this soliloquy Hamlet says nothing believes that it is consistent with Hamlet's horror at his about his feeling that his mother's incest has sullied *him*. And *solid* has a real connection with what follows. Two things keep Hamlet from eluding his woes: his flesh, which is too solid to melt away, and God's law against suicide.¹⁷

Other of Wilson's changes from the traditional readings follow.

I, 3, 64-65

"But do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new-hatch'd, unfledg'd *courage* . . ."

Wilson here prefers the Q2 *courage* to the F1 *comrade* because *courage* also appears in Q1 (2:295). "The agreement between Q2 and Q1," he says, "makes it tolerably certain that *courage* appeared in the prompt-book and that *comrade*, like so many of the easier readings of F1, was nothing but a paraphrase or makeshift of Scribe C." As in the other cases, Wilson's theories about the history of the texts might have served just as well to prove the opposite. If Wilson had liked the F1 *comrade* (as have most editors), he could have used the *rots* argument against *courage* instead of using the *sullied* argument in favor of it.¹⁸ Certainly the insertion of *courage* in the place of *comrade* is in keeping with the habits of the makers of Q1.¹⁹

II, 2, 137

"Or given my heart a *working*, mute and dumb"

Wilson prefers the Q2 *working* to the F1 *winking* and declares, ". . . There can be no doubt at all, despite the editors, that *working* was the word Shakespeare intended."²⁰ He blames the "change" on Scribe P, the maker of the prompt copy, but his argument is based, as Parrott and

Craig show, on a misunderstanding of the word *winking*.²¹ If Wilson had felt as Parrott and Craig do about it, he might have discredited Q2 either through the compositor or through the press corrector. In this case there is no Q1 reading to aid or hinder.

II, 2, 506

"But who, *ah woe*, had seen the mobled Queen —"

This Q2 variant Wilson prefers to the F1 (and Q1) *O who*. He ascribes the F1 reading to a change made by Scribe P as in the case just preceding (1:73). But if Wilson had preferred the F1 and Q1 reading, he might very well have laid the Q2 variant to a combination of mistakes by the compositor and the press corrector of Q2. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Wilson's arguments would have been as follows:

The compositor omitted the *h* from *o who*,²² making it *o wo*, and the press corrector, who never consulted the manuscript, amended it to *a woe*, normalizing the spelling of *wo* and changing the *o* to *a* to avoid unpleasant repetition.

II, 2, 614-616

"Must like a whore unpack my heart with words,
And fall a-cursing like a very drab,
A stallyon."

Wilson prefers the Q2 *stallyon* to the F1 *scullion*, though Q1 has *scalion* and Wilson shows that he accepts this as a misprint for *scullion*. He assumes again that Scribe P made the change to *scullion* and that the reporter of Q1 therefore heard *scullion* on the stage.²³ He could, of course, have discredited *stallyon* just as well—by charging it to the compositor of Q2, to the press corrector of Q2, or to a combination of the two. If he had chosen to do the last, he might have assumed that the compositor set *scullion* up as *stullion* (Wilson explains that he often confused Shakspeare's *c*'s and *t*'s (1:111), and that the corrector miscorrected it to *stallyon*.²⁴ Wilson insists on *stallyon* because he thinks its meaning, "a male whore," fits in exactly with *whore* and *drab*. There is no indication, however, that stallions in Wilson's sense of the word had a reputation for cursing. Scullions, on the other hand, did so. In this connection Kittredge

cites *Henry IV*, pt. 2, II, 1, 65—the Page's abuse of the name-calling hostess:

"Away, you scullion! you rampallian! you fustilarian!" (p 24).

IV, 2, 18

"He keeps them like an *apple* in the corner of his jaw,
first mouth'd to be last swallowed"

Wilson insists on *apple*, the Q2 variant, instead of *ape* of F1 and Q1. As in the case of the three variants just discussed, Wilson blames Scribe P for the "change" (1:72). The press corrector of Q2 might just as well have been at fault. Wilson elsewhere pictures him as having made many "miscorrections due to misunderstanding" (I: 146-50). It is clear that their creator gave Scribe P and the press corrector of Q2 a great deal in common. In defense of the *apple* variant Wilson quotes a phrase from *Henry VIII* (V, iv, 63-64), which indicates that theatergoers liked apples. Kittredge, however, points out that the peculiar style of eating suggests an ape (*op. cit.*, p. 250).

V, 1, 260

"To sing *sage* Requiem, and such rest to her"

Here Wilson prefers *sage* Requiem of F1 to a Requiem of Q2, blaming the Q2 "error" on the press corrector. On the other hand, to discredit F1 Scribe C has only to be blamed for one more error. Wilson is almost unique among editors in choosing this reading.

But why, one is moved to ask, why has Wilson so often turned against the generally accepted readings? The situation being what it was, why couldn't he have saved us suffering by defending the readings we were all used to? The answer is that Wilson's point of view was different from that of the old editors. They were merely bringing out editions of *Hamlet*. Wilson was actuated by the spirit of research, and he was influenced by all that implies in the twentieth century. An editor is traditionally conservative. A researcher usually sets out to destroy tradition. The procedure is not necessarily a conscious one. The researcher hopes that he will make discoveries, and when he sees the possibility of doing so it is difficult for him not to rationalize a proof. It is a subtle infection of insidious growth.

Since, in most cases of disagreement between the texts, Wilson had abundant material at hand for proving *any* reading wrong, it was only human for him to justify his years of work by proving that, up to now, our editions of *Hamlet* had contained many errors.

To put the whole thing briefly, Wilson has not superseded the work of earlier editors, as he seems to think he has. He is "ladling butter from alternate tubs" as well as they, and, though he *may* know considerably more about the tubs than did his predecessors, this knowledge in most cases has told him nothing about which tub to ladle from.²⁵ Moreover, his desire to amaze the world with a new concoction has often led him to the wrong one.

The statement in the last paragraph—that Wilson may know considerably more about the history of the texts than did his predecessors—is not intended to indicate that all his elaborate conjectures about the history of these texts are acceptable. Scribe P's place in the story is particularly hard to believe in. The changes Wilson supposes him to have made in *Hamlet* indicate that, after he turned the manuscript over to the theater, Shakspeare's control over it ceased; in fact, that Shakspeare was not available for consultation about the meaning of difficult passages (1:172-73). This theory of Wilson is almost enough to make us fear that he is a Baconian fifth columnist.

University of Delaware.

¹*The Tragedy of Hamlet*, New York, 1939, p. viii

However, one cannot help admiring Wilson for his extraordinary willingness to make conjectures. At one point (*op. cit.*, p. 164) he undertakes to guess what changes the Q2 compositor would have made if he had set up an omitted passage

²*What* here means *bank*

³Shakspeare often connects the ideas of eating and dishonorable inactivity. Examples are

1. *Hamlet*, IV, 4, 33-35

"What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed?"

2. *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 1, 26-27.

"That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honor
Even till a Lethe'd dullness."

3. *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 6, 65-66

"I have heard that Julius Cæsar
Grew fat with feasting there"

⁴*Op. cit.*, Vol 11, pp. 177-179.

⁵*Ibid.*, Vol I, pp 106-112.

⁶See below, the last paragraph of this article.

⁷Vol I, p 99 and pp. 114-119. In arriving at his conclusions about Shakspeare's handwriting and spelling, Wilson makes use of the assumption that three autograph pages in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* were written by Shakspeare.

⁸Vol. I, pp. 121-151. One of the peculiarities of this press corrector was that he never consulted the original manuscript.

⁹Vol. I, p 161. Wilson believes that the compositor of Q2 made use of Q1 only while he was setting up the first act.

¹⁰Wilson uses this argument to support the Q2 reading *courage* of I, 3, 65 (Vol. II, p 295). See also my discussion of this Wilson reading below, p 160. It is significant that *courage* is also in Act. I

¹¹Vol II, p. 316. Nor would Wilson have had any difficulty in justifying either reading textually had Q1 agreed with F1, instead of with Q2. In that case he could have supported the Q2 *ross* by blaming the F1 reading on Scribe P. If Scribe P put *ross* into the prompt-book, the reporter of Q1 would naturally have heard it on the stage; so the identity of Q1 and F1 would prove nothing (Wilson—p. 311—uses this argument in support of the amended Q2 reading *sullied* of I, 2, 129.) The support of Q1 would not have helped Wilson to defend the F1 *ross*, but there he would need no help. We have seen how he gets along without that support.

¹²Wilson's abuse of Scribe C is so unremitting that one feels at times like defending the poor creature—until one remembers that, after all, Wilson has the right, having created Scribe C, to treat him as he pleases.

¹³This reading was first suggested by the novelist George MacDonald in 1885. Wilson says (Vol. II, p. 307) that a like suggestion was put forward by Dowden in the Arden edition, but, though Dowden mentions the possibility of the *sullied* reading in his notes, he prefers *solid*.

¹⁴As Parrott and Craig observe in their edition of the second quarto (Princeton University Press, 1938, pp 37-38) the Q1 version of the "To be or not to be" soliloquy makes Hamlet console himself for the ills of this life by thinking of the Everlasting Judge who will reward him for his good deeds at death. Another example of the Q1 reporter's incompetence is the passage about the far weed on Lethes wharf which has been discussed above. By omitting the last part of the sentence, "Wouldst thou not stir in this," the reporter makes the Ghost advise Hamlet to be dull.

¹⁵Even were the reporter of Q1 a man to be trusted, we could not be sure that *griev'd* proves *sallied* to be a past participle. It is not unusual to find a past participle coupled with another adjective not a past participle. Note, for instance, *Hamlet*, III, 3, 94-95:

"And that his soul may be as *damnd* and black
As hell, whereto it goes."

Also *Hamlet*, II, 2, 531:

"About her *lank* and all o'er-seem'd loins."

Sallied may have been a phonetic spelling to represent Burbadge's pronunciation of *solid*. There are many examples of phonetic spellings in Q1. Examples:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. pollax (Polacks, I, 1, 63) | 5. sellierige (cellarage, I, 5, 151) |
| 2. ceasen (season, I, 3, 93) | 6. trapically (tropically, III, 2, 47) |
| 3. bace (base, I, 4, 71) | 7. dan'd (donned, IV, 5, 52) |
| 4. wherling (whirling, I, 5, 133) | |

Trapically and *dan'd* are especially significant, for they are indications of the fact that the confusion of *o* and *a* was common in Shakspeare's time. In his edition of *Hamlet* (p. 146) Kittredge gives the following examples of spellings which indicate this: *farren* for *foreign*; *claspole* for *clospole*; *quondam* for *quondam*.

On the other hand, the word *sallied* may merely have been one of the many outrageous errors in words of Q1. Some of them are amazingly wide of the mark. Examples:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. invelmorable (invulnerable, I, 1, 45) | 7. Artue (artery, I, 4, 83) |
| 2. impudent, (impotent, I, 2, 29) | 8. argaman (Hyrcanian, II, 2, 272) |
| 3. generall (generous, I, 3, 74) | 9. calagulate (coagulate II, 2, 484) |
| 4. dreams (drains, I, 4, 10) | 10. Epitooth (epitaph, II, 2, 551) |
| 5. ceremonies (cerements, I, 4, 48) | 11. abominable (abominably, III, 2, 40) |
| 6. beekles (beetles, I, 4, 70) | 12. laught (length, V, 2, 276) |
| | 13. vessels (eisel, V, 1, 299) |

¹⁶Wilson does, in fact, make this supposition to explain the *a* in *sallied* (Vol. II, p. 310). That is, he blames the Q1 reporter for the incorrect spelling of the word at the same time that he praises him for making its meaning "incontestably clear."

¹⁷Kittredge (*Op. cit.*, p. 146) points out a significant parallel from *Henry IV*, pt. 2, III, 1, 47-49.

"And the continent,
Weary of solid firmness melt itself
into the sea"

Wilson also argues that Shakspeare could not have made Hamlet speak of his solid flesh, for Burbadge, who played the part, was getting fat in 1601, and such an epithet would have "convulsed the playhouse with laughter and ruined the play." In order to make the situation more ridiculous and impossible, Wilson pictures Burbadge as striking himself despairingly on the breast before reciting the soliloquy. By this Wilson merely proves that a fat man could burlesque the line if he liked. He does not prove that the line is ridiculous in itself, and it is obvious that no good actor, whether fat or thin, would have difficulty in making it effective. As Parrott and Craig remind us (*op. cit.*, p. 77) "too too solid" has been in practically all acting versions of *Hamlet* since 1623, and we have no record of its having ruined the play.

¹⁸See above, p. 160. See also Kittredge's arguments that *courage* is out of place here, both because of its meaning and because of its accent (*op. cit.*, p. 156).

¹⁹See above, note 15.

²⁰1. 74-75. Wilson declares that all editors before him have used the F1 variant, and Parrott and Craig and Kittredge, who have edited *Hamlet* since Wilson wrote, have also preferred F1 here.

²¹*Op. cit.*, p. 117. 'Wilson explains the Q2 text as meaning 'the secret thoughts of the heart' and insists that *winking* taken with *mute* and *dumb* is a 'case of sheer misunderstanding.' But *winking* in this passage does not mean 'sleeping' as Wilson interprets it, but rather 'closing the eyes to,' 'conniving at.' Cf. *Oth.* IV, 2, 77, *Cym.*, V, 4, 194, and *K. H. V.*, II, 2, 55 . . ."

²²According to Wilson omitting letters was one of the Q2 compositor's faults. See his list, Vol. 1, p. 118.

²³1. 71 and 2: 312.

²⁴Wilson makes comparable conjectures in connection with other readings. See Vol. I, pp. 144-146.

²⁵Wilson admits that he has been at times confronted with situations where, because of the great number and variety of the causes of corruption to the texts, it has been "impossible to feel certain which of the two readings offered best represents Shakespeare's intention" (Vol. II, p. 176). In the cases cited above, however, Wilson claims textual backing for his choice of variants.

"MAKING THE GREEN ONE RED"

By RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

ARTHUR MURPHY is generally credited with being the first to suggest the correct reading of "Making the green one red" (*Macbeth*, II, 2, 64), in the *Gray's Inn Journal* for 27th January, 1752.¹ In his *Life of Garrick*, Murphy himself claims he was the first to read the line correctly, and further that he brought Garrick around to his point of view: "It is true that he [Garrick] was for some time in the habit of saying, the *green-one* red; but upon consideration he adopted the alteration which was first proposed by this writer in *The Gray's Inn Journal*."²

Without invalidating Murphy's claim, it should be noted that Thomas Sheridan in his *A Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762) made the same point: "There is a passage which, as it has been generally spoken on the stage, and read by most people, is downright nonsense; which yet in itself is a very fine one, and conveys an idea truly sublime. I mean an expression of *Macbeth's* after he has committed the murder, where he says,

Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hands? No—these my hands will rather,
The multitudinous sea incarnardine [*sic*],
Making the green one, red.

"Now the last line pronounced in that manner, calling the sea, the green one, makes flat nonsense of it. But if we read it with proper emphasis and stop, and say, making the green—one red. Here is a most sublime idea conveyed, that his hands, dipped into the sea, would change the colour of the whole ocean from green to red; making the green—one red."³

No indication is here that Sheridan knew anything of Murphy's criticism; the two men, so far as mention of one another appears in their work, were apparently not acquainted.⁴ And in his long career of acting, Sheridan had ample opportunity to arrive at his conclusion independently of, and perhaps before, Murphy.

Sheridan's career began in Dublin at the Theatre Royal

in Smock Alley, in January, 1743, where he was a success in *Richard III*. In the spring of 1744 he was engaged for Covent Garden, where on March 31 he played *Hamlet*; April 3, *Hamlet*; April 5, *Hamlet*; April 13, *Macbeth*; and April 18, *Julius Caesar*.⁵ Garrick employed him for the season of 1744-5 at Drury Lane; the following season he returned to Dublin as manager of the Theatre Royal, where he remained until 1754. Because of some trouble in Dublin he came back to London for two years; in 1756 he was again in Dublin. Soon thereafter he began his lectures on elocution, a subject in which he was deeply interested all his life.⁶

It is important to note that Sheridan was not in London in 1752 when No. 15 of the *Gray's Inn Journal*, which contained Murphy's criticism, was published; and further, that Sheridan acted in *Macbeth* at Covent Garden on April 13, 1744, only a little more than three months after Garrick played *Macbeth* at Drury Lane on January 7, 1744, "as written by Shakespeare."⁷

What version of *Macbeth* Sheridan used at Covent Garden in 1744 we do not know. Presumably it was Davenant's; if so, he would notice that Davenant had foreseen the difficulty of the "green one red," for his version reads:

can the Sea afford
Water enough to wash away the stain?
No, they would sooner add a tincture to
The Sea, and turn the green into a red.⁸

And if Sheridan followed Garrick's example at Drury Lane and produced *Macbeth* "as written by Shakespeare," I believe we can assume that Sheridan put into practice what he afterward preached in his *Lectures on Elocution* about the "green one red." Archer and Lowe, in "'Macbeth' on the Stage," say that "In the Dagger Scene he [Sheridan] almost equalled Garrick. That he would speak the lines accurately there can be no doubt, for he was above all an elocutionist."⁹ And the testimony of Thomas Davies that "some critics did not scruple to . . . prefer Sheridan's performance . . . [in] *Macbeth* . . . to the other's [Garrick's] utmost efforts in . . . [this] . . . part"¹⁰ should be taken into account. That Sheridan himself placed im-

portance on his interpretation of the line is shown by his quoting in his *Lectures on the Art of Reading* (1775)¹¹ the entire passage I have given above from *A Course of Lectures on Elocution*. He would hardly have done so had he not thought he was the first to read the line correctly.

Therefore the supposition is easy to make that when Sheridan went to Drury Lane in the fall of 1744 to act for Garrick it was his criticism rather than Murphy's that led Garrick to change his interpretation. But of this there can obviously be no first-hand proof. We might remember, however, that eight years elapsed between Garrick's 'Macbeth' in 1744 and Murphy's *Gray's Inn Journal* in 1752; and over fifty years between Garrick's 'Macbeth' and Murphy's *Life of Garrick* in 1801. Time has a way of confusing memory.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹*Macbeth*, Variorum edition, Phila., 1903, p. 141.

²London, 1801, p. 82.

³Providence, 1796, p. 84.

⁴Murphy mentions Sheridan quite casually in his *Life of Garrick*, pp. 360-365, as been employed by Garrick for the season of 1761-2 and as being especially good in *King John*.

⁵John Genest, *Some Account of English Stage, Bath*, 1832, IV, 74-75.

⁶DNB.

⁷Genest, *op. cit.*, IV, 62.

⁸*Macbeth*, altered by Sir William Davenant, London, 1674, II, 1. J. D. E. Williams, in *Sir William Davenant's Relation to Shakespeare* (Liverpool, 1905), has pointed out (p. 84) that Davenant consistently cleared up for the audience what he thought was obscure in Shakespeare. Williams does not, however, go into the question of how much the later editors of Shakespeare have relied on this "clearing up" by Davenant. The later editors have, of course, been mostly occupied with Davenant's mutilations of Shakespeare.

⁹*English Illustrated Magazine*, Dec., 1888.

¹⁰*Memoirs of Garrick*, London, 1784, I, 300.

¹¹Third edition, London, 1787, p. 114.

HAMLET AND THE GONZAGO MURDERS

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

IN what may be called the recent past some professed Shakspeare scholars have found difficulties in the interpretation, significance and technique of one of the most important elements in *Hamlet*: the mouse-trap. The giants in Shaksperian scholarship of past generations, Dr. Johnson, Capell, Malone, Steevens, Verplanck, White, Furnivall, Dyce, Knight, Hudson, Furness, Rolfe, and others, were not in the slightest degree disturbed by this famous scene. It is only modern scholarship, looking for novelty, which finds it necessary to ask the following questions: Why did Hamlet permit the dumbshow to be presented (at the beginning of the performance), thus risking the success of his plan to catch the conscience of the king? Did it not occur to Hamlet that his uncle-father, seeing his crime enacted "in every detail" (1) in the dumbshow, might order the play (*The Murder of Gonzago*) to be stopped? Why *did* not Claudius stop the play? Why did Hamlet set his trap doubly, first with a dumbshow and then with dialogue which repeats the matter of the dumbshow? Why did Shakspeare introduce a dumbshow so utterly unlike dumbshows in other plays of the period? Why, after seeing the dumbshow, does Claudius ask "Is there no offence in't?"

In their attempts to answer these questions, the inquirers have ignored the text of the play, have left common sense and known dramatic technique out of consideration and resorted to fantastic speculations, guesses and distortions. One theory, which deserves to be characterized as 'silly,' avows that the Ghost's revelations to Hamlet were false, and that consequently Claudius did not see his crime enacted and had no reason for being disturbed by the dumbshow. Other theories, not so wild as this, though no less absurd, aver that the King did not see or notice the dumbshow because (being an ill-mannered country bumpkin?) he was engaged in conversation with his queen and Polonius, or because—as a result of carelessness on Hamlet's part?—the royal couple were sitting in a location from which the dumbshow was invisible, or because—as in a recent production of the play in New York—the King was busy eating French

pastry (no doubt from the nearest Danish pastry shop), or because (as was suggested at a meeting of the Modern Language Association) the King was drunk. There being not the slightest particle of justification in the text for any of these perversions of Shakspeare's obvious intentions, another distinguished scholar, addicted to a different variety of surmises, opined that the dumbshow was not Shakspeare's work and had been foisted into the play by a stupid interpolator. Reference to the dialogue between Hamlet and Ophelia is sufficient to disprove the theory.

Upon the arrival of the players in Elsinore, Hamlet was reminded of a play entitled *The Murder of Gonzago*, which, as luck would have it, the troupe had in its bag of tricks. That Hamlet knew of it and that the wandering troupe had a copy of it with them signify (to us as the audience witnessing a performance of *Hamlet*) that the play had recently proved a successful entertainment "in the city" and that country folk would be interested in seeing (and hearing) the matter.

Why did Hamlet, or, rather, Shakspeare, choose *The Murder of Gonzago* for performance before the assembled Danish court? Obviously because, as Hamlet informs Horatio, it dealt with certain incidents which paralleled Claudius's crime. ("One scene of it comes near the circumstance Which I have told thee of my father's death.")

It may perhaps be asked how did Shakspeare-Hamlet know of a play dealing with the consequences of the murder of a king or duke (in Shaksperian fiction the two are not distinguished) by poisoning through the ear while indulging in an after-dinner nap in his orchard. (That, of course, is the incident upon which Shakspeare has focused our attention; it is that that is to catch the conscience of the King.) The answer is to be found in a now almost wholly ignored chapter of Italian domestic history. On May 7, 1592 (1), the Marchese Alfonso Gonzaga di Castelfelfredo was murdered by his nephew, the Marchese Rudolfo di Castiglione, who, desiring to get possession of his uncle's estate, sent eight cutthroats to slay him as he was resting at midday. Seven months later the treacherous and lecherous nephew, a pious man (so it is said), was himself shot as he was com-

ing out of church and torn to pieces by a mob of outraged women. It can hardly be doubted that this sensational affair, so typically Italian from the point of view of Elizabethan Englishmen, was a subject for gossip in European circles and served to bring back to memory another and more sensational affair in the Gonzaga family which involved the murder, in October 1537, of Francesco Maria I della sick for some time. Rumor, based on good evidence, asserted that he was murdered by poisoning through the ear. It is noteworthy that, like Hamlet's father, he was buried in full armor. For the historical details of this notorious scandal the reader is referred to an essay by Mr. G. Boughner in the *Modern Language Review* (October 1935, 30: 433-44).*

There can be no doubt that Shakspeare was well acquainted with these matters. The story, says Hamlet, was Rovere, Duke of Urbino, a man of learning, valor, and exceptional character, who (as the historians relate) had been "extant and writ in choice Italian." If the "story" was a play, now lost, it may very well have been a fusion of these two murders in the Gonzaga family, a technique similar to Shakspeare's fusion of two murders (Duncan and Duff in *Macbeth*.) Shakspeare had good reason to take it for granted that not a few in his audience would recall these infamous intrigues.

It must be remembered that up to the presentation of the play, Claudius had no idea that Hamlet suspected him of having murdered his father and seduced his mother. When Rosencrantz and Guildenstern reported that the Prince was delighted with the arrival of the players and had arranged for the performance of a play, the King was much contented to hear him so inclined. It did not even occur to him to ask what the play would be. He might have done so if Polonius had not been so enthusiastic about the matter (III, i, 21-23). If Polonius approved of it, it was beyond a doubt unobjectionable.

Night comes and the invited guests enter the theatre, the great hall in the castle. The King and the Queen take their places, undoubtedly the best seats in the hall, from which

they would have a perfect view of all that passed on the improvised stage before them. As soon as the guests have been seated and conversation has ceased, the dumb-show is enacted. An elderly man, clearly an Italian, wearing a crown (which, of course, King Hamlet had too much sense to do) and seemingly quite sick (which Gertrude's first husband was not) enters with his Queen, very lovingly, and lies down on a bank of flowers. He falls asleep; his affectionate wife leaves him. A "fellow," in Italian costume, enters, approaches the sleeping figure, takes off the crown and kisses it. Thus far all is well; nothing that has happened suggests to Claudius any connection with his crime. Surely Gertrude did not "always of the afternoon" accompany her spouse to his garden couch. Claudius had not removed the crown from his sleeping brother's head—there was no crown to remove—and had not kissed it. When the "fellow" pours poison in the sleeper's ears, Claudius (we may assume) starts; but he is no fool; he instantly realizes that he must not display emotion, that he must steel himself for what may follow. After all, this is only a play, and plays are written about crimes and criminals. It is unfortunate that this play should deal with a crime so similar to his. He should have inquired what the play was about. To stop the performance at this point would be madness. The dumbshow continues. After the dead body has been "carried away," the poisoner woos the Queen "with gifts: she seems loath and unwilling awhile, but in the end accepts his love." Claudius breathes a sigh of relief. He did not have to *woo* Gertrude *after* her husband's demise; she had been his mistress *before* her husband's untimely taking-off. And it may be doubted that Claudius wooed Gertrude "with gifts"; a queen is not wooed with "rings and things and fine array." (True, Ghost Hamlet laments that his brother's "wicked gifts" had seduced his "seeming-virtuous queen," but the "traitorous gifts" he had in mind are the "witchcraft of his wit," his cleverness, his amiable personality.)

The dumbshow, which the audience may regard as a dramatist's way of suggesting what is to come or of disclosing a past incident which it is important for the spectators to know if the story of the succeeding play is to be understood, is over. The spectators have a few moments for gen-

eral chatter or for comments on what they had seen. The King, no doubt, has determined not to betray himself, come what come may.

The Player King and Queen enter and indulge in loving dialogue which bears no relation to the Hamlet-Claudius-Gertrude history. The description of the King in the *Gonzago* play (III, ii, 173-174) does not fit the departed Hamlet; and Gertrude, a woman incapable of deep love, did not indulge in such exaggerated expressions of conjugal devotion. "In second husband let me be accurst," protests the Player Queen. Many women have said such things to their husbands. It was in bad taste, to be sure, to make references to second husbands in Gertrude's presence. When the Player Queen generalizes that "None wed the second but who killed the first," she is giving expression to such an absurd sentiment that Hamlet's audience may manifest its disgust, and some may wonder how such a stupid piece of work could have been chosen by Hamlet; but what can you expect from a madman? The play is "wormwood" to more than to the Queen, we may be sure. It is fortunate for Hamlet's plan that the Player Queen says what is manifestly untrue. Had she said, "None wed again, but who betray'd the first," Claudius would have been justified in ending the play then and there.

The speeches which follow between the Player King and Queen, continuing to harp on the theme of second marriage, besides indulging in psychological platitudes, for the time being relieves the King of any anxiety about himself. When Hamlet's remark about the Player Queen keeping her word (line 241) shows that he is familiar with the play, Claudius boldly asks "Is there no offence in't?" He does this to give those sitting about him the impression that he is concerned for his Queen's feelings, lest the players might say something offensive about second marriages. Hamlet, pretending to misunderstand the King's meaning, assures his uncle that "*they* [the actors] do but jest, poison in jest." Claudius infers that the play may prove to be a comedy, and pleasantly asks "What do you call the play?" Hamlet, now playing the rôle of chorus, then informs him (and the others sitting and standing near) that this is the play about

the notorious Gonzago murder. The King is greatly relieved to learn this; he had heard something about that affair; the business about poison in the ears had no reference to himself, thank God. This is confirmed, he thinks, by Hamlet's remark, "Let the *galled* jade wince, *our* [your and my] withers are unwrung."

The play continues. Lucianus enters and Hamlet explains he is "nephew to the King." Claudius happily notes that Hamlet had not said "Brother to the King." Hamlet engages in bawdy pleasantries with Ophelia, and seems at first not to be affected by the proceedings on the stage. However, the "damnable faces" of Lucianus, suggesting guilt, fear of discovery, horror of the crime, are too much for Claudius and he blanches, grows pale. Thereupon Hamlet, suddenly frenzied by the spectacle which re-enacts the slaying of his father, jumps up, confronts his uncle, and excitedly proclaims, "He poisons him in the garden . . . for's estate. His name's . . . *Gonzago* [no, not Claudius]! The story is extant, and writ in choice . . . Italian [not Danish]. You* shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wifel" Hamlet's excitement and what sounds like a threat to divulge the adulterous relationship between Claudius and Gertrude, besides what he may know or suspect about the poisoning, is too much for Claudius—and he breaks up the performance. To the assembled court it seems that the King's action is prompted solely by Hamlet's mad behavior and by the tasteless play he had selected for performance. Hamlet is convinced he has caught the conscience of the King; but more than that, *The Murder of Gonzago* has enabled him to play with his crafty uncle as a cat does with a mouse. That is why we have a dumbshow which is so like and so unlike Claudius's crime. And Shakspeare has succeeded in entertaining his audience with an intensely dramatic and stirring scene—one of the most nearly perfect scenes in the whole range of English literature.

*For a vivid account of the 1592 murder and of the character of the nephew (so like Claudius) the reader is referred to *Allgemeine Encyclopädie* (1862), 74: 189,—an article which was translated for me by my friend Dr. Ralph Rosenberg

**This "You" may be addressed to the audience on the stage rather than to Claudius alone.

THE RELATION BETWEEN *THE MERRY WIVES
OF WINDSOR* AND JONSON'S *EVERY
MAN IN HIS HUMOUR*

By SALLIE SEWELL

FEW of Shakspeare's plays have occasioned more "throwing about of brains," more weeping and wailing, and gnashing of scholarly teeth, than *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (*MW*). Many reasons have been adduced for the inferior quality of the comedy, as well as for the degradation of Falstaff; too many, in fact, for them to be listed here, and certainly too many for another to be suggested. The present study is therefore not intended as an apology or explanation for *MW*, but simply as another attempt to hold the eel of influence by the tail. In other words, the following investigation is intended to present the apparent relation between *MW* and Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour* (*EMIH*).

To begin with, it is necessary to consider the question of date. As for *EMIH*, Jonson himself tells us in the 1616 folio edition that the play was "first acted in the yeere 1598," a statement which is corroborated by the appearance of the quarto in 1602, by a letter in State Papers mentioning the performance, and by the failure of Meres to mention Jonson as a writer of comedies before 1598. The date of *MW*, though far more difficult to determine, is derived from its obvious relation to the two parts of *Henry IV*, the production of which is almost certainly 1597-98. If, as most scholars believe, and as Kittredge tersely puts it, "there can be no question that the *Merry Wives* is later than *Henry IV*,"² it must accordingly be dated between the latter part of 1598 and the appearance of the quarto in 1601-2. With Charles R. Baskervill, Maurice Castelain, C. H. Herford, and Percy Simpson, let us accept 1598 as the date of *EMIH*; and, with H. C. Hart, G. L. Kittredge, and E. K. Chambers, 1598-1602 as the date of *MW*.³

For the purposes of the present study, in other words, *EMIH* is viewed as having preceded *MW* by a period of a few months to three years. The further question of Shak-

speare's having had access to the Jonson play before its publication in 1602 presents no difficulties. Though we know nothing of the manuscript, we do know from the list of characters in the Jonson folio that Shakspeare acted in the original production, creating the rôle of the elder Lorenzo (Knowell).⁴ At rehearsals and at performances, when the play was "sundry times publickly acted," he had the chance to observe not only particular lines and scenes, but more fundamentally, matters of technique and their effect on the audience. Given such an opportunity, it is hard to believe that even if he never made conscious use of the material, he would not in some way have been influenced by Jonson's methods.

Turning now to the three fundamental resemblances between the two plays—those of character, plot, and the choice of identical current foibles for ridicule,—we consider first the question of character, limiting the discussion to the three pairs in which the kinship is most striking: to Stephen and Slender, Bobadil and Falstaff, Kately and Ford. The similarities between Stephen and Slender, some of which are typed characteristics of the gull but some of which are individual, may be briefly summarized. Both are stupid creatures, dependent for their ideas, their social standing, their actions, and their very words upon their respective uncles and cousins. Slender is constantly reminding us that he keeps a servant, "my man Simple," and that he lives "like a poor gentleman born," and Stephen's claim to gentlemanly propensities runs like a refrain throughout the play. Stephen intends to take up hawking, dueling, tobacco smoking, and cursing simply because these are established earmarks of the class; he introduces himself to Prospero as "somewhat melancholie, but you shall command me in whatsoever is incident to a Gentleman."

Both use effeminate expressions or oaths to cover their constant embarrassment, Slender's favorites being "Ay" and "Forsooth," Stephen's, "By my fackins" and "Forsooth." Both write verses to their ladies and are dependent upon books of instruction to guide their activities, particularly their amorous ones; just as Stephen can't go hawking without a book, Slender can master no conversation without his collection of sonnets or riddles. Both attempt to cover their

physical cowardice by swaggering and boasting, Slender asserting that he is not afraid of bears, not even a little bit; Stephen proclaiming what he would do to the insolent servant, "if he could catch him."

With regard to treatment, Shakspeare's Slender, as we might expect, is the more sympathetically handled. His helplessness, portrayed by a capable actor, has something of the appealing quality of a Charlie Chaplin characterization or of the half-witted Dannie in the recent novelette, *Of Mice and Men*. "For though I cannot remember what I did when you made me drunk," Slender says wistfully, "yet I am not *altogether* an ass." Then he adds, "I'll ne'er be drunk whilst I live again but in honest, civil, godly company, for this trick. If I be drunk, I'll be drunk with those that have the fear of God, and not with drunken knaves." Although Stephen's stupidity, enhanced by affectation, is more clearly in the line of the "true ridiculous," the changes and additions of Jonson's revision tend, as I have shown elsewhere,⁶ to render him more sympathetic in the manner of Shakspeare.

The similarity between Bobadil and Falstaff is peculiarly interesting because of the reputation each character bears to the canon of his respective author, Bobadil being ranked as Jonson's supreme creation, and Falstaff, regarded as a sort of bastard, not to be mentioned in the same breath as the lusty companion of Henry IV. Castelain expresses the typical attitude toward Bobadil in calling him "La plus amusante et la plus vivante silhouette que Jonson ait crayonnée."⁷ J. B. Priestley expresses the view of all scholars who have shed critical tears over the degradation of Falstaff when he says, "The Falstaff I am discussing has nothing to do with the impostor, the up-river bully, the provincial dupe of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*."⁷ Dowden, considering the Shakspeare play itself as nothing but a grudging attempt on the dramatist's part to show Falstaff in love, according to royal instructions, expresses a similar view:

"Falstaff he was not prepared to recall from heaven or from hell. He dressed up a fat rogue, brought forward for the occasion from the back premises of the poet's imagination in Falstaff's clothes."⁸

It is my view, however, that if Shakspeare was not prepared to recall the genuine Falstaff from heaven or from hell, the impostor was not derived entirely "from the back regions of the poet's imagination." On the contrary, and in line with Shakspeare's usual methods of composition, this Falstaff seems to have originated in his most recent acquaintance among the braggarts, "the inimitable Bobadil." If it is a coincidence, it is a striking one, that vanity, the very quality which is Bobadil's distinguishing characteristic, is the trait used to transform Falstaff from a clever, irrepressible rogue—he was always a parasite and a braggart—into the stupid gull of *MW*. If Falstaff had simply intended to sponge upon the jovial ladies as he had sponged upon Mistress Quickly, he would have been far more than a match for their wits. He could very easily have used them as his "exchequer" and his "region in Guianna." But he, of all people, the "tun of flesh," "the mountain of mummy," has suddenly become vain, as vain as Bobadil, of his "good parts." So certain has he become of his fascination for the ladies that he is duped by the grossest flattery from Mistress Quickly; and as soon as Mistress Page looks at him, he says that "she even now gave me good eyes too . . . did course o'er my exteriors with such a greedy intention that the appetite of her eye did seem to scorch me like a burning-glass."

Not only this, but his vanity gets the best of him three times, causing him to be "stewed in grease . . . thrown into the Thames and cooled, glowing hot . . . like a horseshoe," to be beaten "grievously in the shape of a woman," and to be humiliated again as Herne the Hunter. No wonder we accept his own view of his transformation. "I must have laid my brain in the sun and dried it," he says, "that it wants matter to prevent so gross an o'er-reaching as this." Later he suspects, as we do, that his brain should be "ta'en out and buttered and gi'en to a dog for a New Year's gift."⁹

The essential difference between the two braggarts, ironically enough, is that where Falstaff verges toward the typically Jonsonian gull, Bobadil borders on the more varied, unpredictable character associated with Shakspeare. After the first scene there is no uncertainty as to what Falstaff will do—or rather, as to what will be done to him. Like Mat-

thew and Stephen of *EMIH*, he functions more or less as a football dummy, a target for the attacks of others. Bobadil, on the other hand, though he is humiliated in the end, enjoys many triumphs, sponging completely upon Cob and so impressing the other gulls with his magnificence that they follow him around imitating his every word and gesture. Another bit of ironical interchange is apparent in the following quotations, which the reader may care to place. In the first, the character himself is speaking, replying with typical false modesty to the statement that he is fascinating. "Not I, I assure thee," he says. "Setting the attraction of my good parts aside, I have no other charms." In the second, a long suffering host is describing the activities of his guest: "And here's the jest, he is in love with ——— and calls her 'Mistress' . . . and the wenches, they do so jeer and tihee at him."

Turning now to the even more remarkable resemblance between Ford and Kately, we note that their similarity has been observed by almost every critic dealing with either play. Although some have considered the likeness superficial, merely the co-incidental treatment of a common passion, the more typical attitude is expressed by Palmer, "Kately is first cousin to Master Ford,"¹⁰ and by Hart, who says of Ford's malady, "It is a jealousy so unjust and unreasoning that it recalls Kately's in *Every Man In His Humour* more than any other creation I am aware of."¹¹

To my mind, the similarity between them hinges upon two essential points, both integrally related to Jonson's *humour* theory.¹² First, the jealousy is regarded as a disease or abnormality, something to be cured. Knowell asks of Kately's malady, "what lunacie is this that haunts this man?" and Kately himself describes it as a disease which "like a pestilence . . . doth infect the houses of the braine." Kately resolves to "shake the fever off that thus shakes me," but as the play proceeds his obsession grows steadily stronger, reaching the degree of neurosis in the dramatic scene of Act III where he resolves never to leave his wife unguarded. Later, still without the slightest grounds for suspicion, when Cob reports that a crowd of people are in his home, he demands, "which of them was it that first kist my wife?"

The jealousy of Ford, though accorded fewer soliloquies

and less careful analysis than that of Kately, is likewise regarded as a neurosis. Mistress Ford tells us that it is not a newly acquired passion, aroused like that of Othello or Posthumus by the insinuations of a villain, but his habitual state when she says of Falstaff's letter, "This will give eternal food for his jealousy." Evans says of it, "Why this is lunatics. This is a mad dog." Page says, "I would not ha' your distemper in this kind for the wealth of Windsor Castle. You are not to go loose any longer, you must be pinioned." Ford himself recognizes that it is the desire to prove himself sane which motivates his frenzied attempts to find his wife guilty. "Who says this is improvident jealousy," he rationalizes. "My wife hath sent to him." In the end he admits that he has been possessed of a devil and is now cured.

The second distinguishing feature, that which differentiates the jealousy of Ford and Kately from the suspicions of Othello and other jealous husbands, is its apparent isolation from love. Neither ever mentions his affection for his wife. Men of wealth, both of them, they regard their wives as part of property which must be protected. Kately prizes his "treasure" because he imagines other men desire her, and for that reason only resolves not to leave her unguarded. Ford, whose rich coffer has attracted Falstaff and who is known to Pistol as "of substance good," also closely associates his wife and his ducats. For him as for Kately, the "hell of having a false woman" is simply, "my bed shall be abused, my coffer ransacked." Though he has not the slightest cause for suspicion, Ford would "rather trust a Fleming with my butter, Parson Hugh the Welshman with my cheese . . . than my wife with herself."

The jealousy of each is motivated by vanity as well. "The hell of having a false woman" consists not in her loss of honor or chastity, but in the husband's being a "slave to fear"—fear that he will be a cuckold and have his "reputation gnawn at." Each, in contrast to Claudio, Posthumus, or Othello, is constantly concerned with what other people will think of him. Each "must set a face on't to the world," Kately being afraid to turn Downright out of his house for fear of what people will say, and Ford resolving to "seek

out Falstaff" so that he will be "rather praised for this than mocked." Each is less concerned with being a cuckold than being called one. "I like not these terms," says Kately, and "Death, these phrases are intolerable." "I shall not only receive this villainous wrong," says Ford, "but stand under the adoption of abominable terms . . . Cuckold! the devil himself hath not such a name."

The difference between the two characters seems to result largely from the different interests of the two dramatists, the more analytical ones of Jonson, and the more dramatic ones of Shakspeare. Kately's obsession has gone much further than Ford's. His brain has become "a mere hour-glass for the running sands of barren suspicion," and he is no longer able to formulate a definite plan of action. All he can do when he suspects his wife is to set Cash to watch her and to make his own presence "an iron barre Twixt the conspiring notions of desire." Ford, on the contrary, though his jealousy is viewed as an obsession, enflamed but not caused by the tales of Nym and Pistol, is still able to think clearly and to act. Determined to "be revenged on Falstaff and laugh at Page," he formulates an elaborate intrigue and begins immediately to carry it out.

Kately, in other words, is more interesting as a study in jealousy—nowhere could one find a more searching or elaborate analysis of the relation between jealousy, miserliness, and vanity than in *EMIH*—but Ford is more dynamic as a character. Shakspeare seems to have recognized here, as he later fails to do in *Hamlet*, the dramatic dangers inherent in an overly introspective character. He subordinates and frequently sacrifices the psychological analysis which is Jonson's *fort* to dramatic method. A large part of what Jonson attains through long and frequent soliloquy Shakspeare suggests by contrasting Ford with Page, by repeating the comments of other characters about him, and above all by showing him in action—bits of technique which Jonson finds it worthwhile to utilize when he revises *EMIH* in 1612.

PLOT STRUCTURE

Although the details of story in the two plays are very different—so different that *EMIH* is by no means to be

considered a source of the *Merry Wives*,—the similarity of their plot structure is striking. Both deal in the main plot with a guller gulled and in the two subordinate ones, first with an elopement and second with the cure of a jealous husband. In the opening scene of *EMIH* Old Knowell makes plans for following his son to town and spying upon him, the remainder of the action being devoted to the turning of the tables upon him by his son and the intriguing servant, Musco-Brainworm. In the same way, the first scene of the *Merry Wives* presents the plans of the original schemer, Falstaff, the rest of the play showing his humiliation at the hands of Mistress Ford and Page, aided and abetted by his own servants or henchmen, Nym, Pistol, and Robin. In both plays the plotter reveals his plans by in-advisedly showing a letter to his servant.

In the elopement plot, Anne of the *Merry Wives*, like Hesperida-Bridget of the Jonson play, is wooed by several ridiculous suitors, at least one of whom is addicted to verse-making and carries on his courtship by book. She ends, also like Bridget, by eloping with a young student poet slightly above her in station, thus outwitting both the undesirable suitors and her parents as Hesperida outwits her suitors and tyrannical brother. In both cases, the elopement is not revealed until the climactic scene of the last act, where it contributes to the general discomfiture of the victims.

The interesting feature of this plot in Shakspeare's play is that it does not in any way dominate the action, as the practice of his romantic comedies would lead us to expect. Instead of focusing attention upon the "love motive," investing Anne (Hesperida-Bridget) "with all the charm of Rosalind or Juliet," clothing the material with his distinctive "poetic language . . . and romantic atmosphere,"¹⁴ Shakspeare definitely subordinates these features to maintain the spirit of everyday English life and the unified comic tone of rollicking merriment. Indeed, he maintains the purely comic mood far more successfully than Jonson, and later when Jonson revises his play his most important changes are in this direction.

To be more specific, the courtship and elopement are introduced in the *Merry Wives* as in *EMIH* not for their own

romantic sakes but to serve two distinctly comic purposes: first, the introduction of amusing character types in the disappointed suitors, Caius and Slender (corresponding to Matthew and Bobadil of *EMIH*), and second, a contribution to the final gulling episode of intrigue comedy. The last scene of *Merry Wives*, though it opens on an alien note in the fairy-like atmosphere of the forest, quickly changes through the medium of the elopement and main plots to the customary disclosure-discomfiture scene of intrigue, the number of gulls almost equaling the traditional accumulation of corpses at the end of a revenge play.

In the second subordinate plot, the cure of a jealous husband, the resemblance, as we have shown, is even more notable. Here, as in the main plot, Shakspeare's essential change, one which Jonson follows (as usual) in the revision, is to provide external motivation for Ford instead of having him motivated entirely from within, as is Kitley. Both Ford and Kitley fit into the guller-gulled motif by plotting against their wives (Ford far more ingeniously than the helpless Kitley, of course) and falling into their own traps. This, as deliberately intended, keeps their passion in the comic realm, a task by no means easy in dealing with jealousy.

Episodic scenes in both plays impede the action of the three main plots, and though in Shakspeare's they are fewer in number they are just as loosely and carelessly related. The practice dueling scene in *Merry Wives*, for instance (II, iii), and indeed the whole dueling episode could be more advantageously cut out than the dueling episode and corresponding practice dueling scene (I, v) in *EMIH*. The inclusion of such episodes, as well as other evidence of unusually careless writing in Shakspeare's play, suggests that his decision to use Jonson's simpler, more flexible plot structure was influenced by the necessity of writing rapidly to fulfill Elizabeth's royal command—perhaps, if tradition is correct, in two weeks. Plot and incident to him are more important than character, and not, as for Jonson, simply a pretext for studying *humour* characters or bringing together a set of amusing people. He does not follow what Herford and Simpson call Jonson's "most significant innovation" in "mak-

ing the exhibition of Humours the sole function of the plot."¹⁵ If he too uses the intrigue plot structure as the means to an end, the end is not the portrayal of character, but simply the practical one of producing an actable play in a hurry.

To appreciate the full significance of Shakspeare's use of Jonsonian plot structure, however, one must recall some of the specific features in his usual technique. The structure of nearly all of his comedies except the two farces, the *Comedy of Errors* and *The Taming of the Shrew*,¹⁶ follows a familiar and well established pattern. The main line of action is more or less serious, involving usually a love affair with which we are sympathetic and for which we desire a happy ending. The genuine comic interest is subordinated to a sub-plot which parallels and frequently parodies the main one, as Elisabeth Woodbridge has clearly illustrated with the Touchstone-Audrey plot of *As You Like It*.¹⁷

The third act climax (the fourth act reversal and counter-plot, the fifth act final triumph and happy ending are familiar features of the main plot and occur frequently in the minor ones as well.

In Jonsonian intrigue comedy, on the other hand, of which *EMIH* is a complicated but typical example, we have almost a reverse situation. Not only is the comic interest dominant and the romantic distinctly subordinated, but there is no rising and falling action and, strictly speaking, no climax. The action proceeds steadily in a series of forward moving circles until it reaches a combination climax and dénouement in the fifth act. The characters, instead of constituting two contending forces as in serious drama or romantic comedy, are divided into a group of aggressors and more or less passive victims. "The resulting plot," as Miss Woodbridge says, "may be briefly described as a network of practical jokes . . . [making] the Shakespearean type of comedy and the Jonsonian type . . . about as near two extremes as can be imagined."¹⁸

Such is the structure not only of *EMIH* but also of *Merry Wives*—and it is the only instance of Shakspeare's use of the purely intrigue plot in comedy! Called by Miss

Dunn "purely a comedy of intrigue, a kind of dramatized Jest Book incident,"¹⁹ *Merry Wives* has for plot nothing more than a "network of practical jokes." There is no element of conflict, no rising or falling action, and except for the final gullings of act five, no climax. An intriguer, a braggart, a jealous husband, and numerous incidental characters are outwitted and humiliated; that is the extent of the action in both plays.

MISCELLANEOUS SIMILARITIES

Concerning the choice of similar, frequently identical, current foibles for ridicule in the two plays, we can do no more than list a few important examples. The popular interest in heraldry is ridiculed in both by having a character trace his ancestry back to a line of fish. Shallow, whose coat of arms is a "dozen white luces," traces his back to pike, while Cob of *EMIH* traces his to herring, "the king of fish." Dueling likewise affords constant amusement, as does the popularity of Spanish dueling terms. In *EMIH* Bobadil's favorite words are "stoccato" and "passada," and Matthew in relating Downright's threat to cudgel him changes the term to *bastinado* "for my more grace." In *Merry Wives* (II, i) the Host continually repeats the word "cavalerio," and Shallow refers disparagingly to "your passes, stoccadoes." In the succeeding scene the Host says in equally mocking tones that he has come "to see thee fight, to see thee . . . foine; to see thee traverse; to see thee pass thy punto, thy stock, thy reverse, thy distance, thy montant."

Bobadil's pride in his dueling accomplishments is treated throughout the play and is more important in the climax of his humiliation. One of his best scenes is in Act I where he boasts of his skill and gives Matthew a lesson with bed staffs. A similar scene in *Merry Wives* (II, iii) shows Caius, also a coward, boasting and practising with his servant, Jack Rugby, the latter professing to know no more of the sport than Matthew.

Closely allied to the fad of dueling is the attempt of the government to prevent it,²⁰ and this too is ridiculed by both Jonson and Shakspeare. Bobadil's flimsy excuse for not accepting Downright's challenge is "I had a warrant of the

peace served on me even now, as I came along by a water bearer." Justice Shallow, although his fingers still itch when he sees a sword out, is "sworn of the peace." His official if not primary purpose in coming to see the anticipated duel is "to prevent the affair and fetch you home."

Still another interest of the gentleman which figures largely in each play, sometimes being ridiculed and sometimes not, is the favorite English pastime of hunting. Page is constantly going hunting, returning from hunting, or inviting his friends to indulge. "I do invite you to-morrow morning to my house to breakfast," he says. "After we'll a-birding together. I have a fine hawk for the bush" (III, iv, 178). Stephen of *EMIH* is planning to take up hunting as part of his campaign to appear a gentleman. He has the hawk, the hood, and the bells, he says; all he lacks is "a book of instruction."

Jonson's ridicule of the widespread dependence upon such books of instruction is confined to this reference, but Shakespeare mentions separately Slender's dependence upon his collection of sonnets and riddles, and Evans' need for a book on dueling. Other gentlemanly foibles which offer their share to the general amusement are the dabbling in poetry, the excessive use of oaths, and the affectation of melancholy. The ridicule of current stage language and customs should be mentioned also, though it is too characteristic of the dramatists in other plays to be very significant. In *EMIH* the old-fashioned taste of Matthew and Bobadil for *Hieronymo* is satirized, and in *Merry Wives* the line of Falstaff, "I will ensconce me behind the arras" is probably a thrust at the over-worked stage trick language. A similar thrust at both actors and audience appears in the reply of Mistress Page to Mistress Ford's instructions to remember her cue: "If I do not act it," she says, "hiss me."

By far the most significant foible ridiculed, however, is the current misunderstanding and misuse of the term *humour*, including its variations, choler, phlegm, etc. A good illustration occurs in the long discussion of it between Cob and Cash in *EMIH*, which ends with the definition of *humour* as "a monster bred in a man by selfe loue, and af-

fectionation, and fed by folly." (III, i). The gulls use it constantly, of course, in an incorrect sense. Matthew says of the composition of his poem, "Fayth, I did it in a humor" (III, iv), and Bobadil uses it in the common, but according to Jonson incorrect, sense of inclination, "It was opposite to my humor" (IV, i). In the folio version the term is frequently substituted for such words as "disposition" or "inclination," showing that Jonson did not always employ his own restricted definition.

In the *Merry Wives* the term is so consistently ridiculed that many critics have regarded Nym as a caricature of Jonson. Nym seldom opens his mouth without using the word, and in I, iii all eight of his speeches contain it: "Is not the humor conceited?" he says. "The good humor is to steal at a minim's rest . . . Will that humour pass . . . The humour rises . . . Humour me the angels . . . I thank thee for that humour . . . I will run no base humour. Here take the humour-letter . . . My humour shall not cool." But Nym is not the only character who uses the word frequently and loosely. Mistress Quickly is constantly confusing the choleric humour with the melancholic or phlegmatic. When Caius loses his temper, she says, "I beseech you, be not so phlegmatic." Later, confusing the choleric with the melancholic, she says, "If he had been thoroughly moved, you should have heard him so loud and so melancholic." Evans says, "pless my soull! how full of cholers and of trembling of the mind—How melancholies I am" and "Pray you, let us not be laughing-stogs to other men's humours," (III, i). Again (III, iv) he says, "This is very fantastical humours and jealousies."

In some ways, with his pompous moralizing, his quoting of Latin when he can't speak good English, his entanglement in a duel, and this constant use of the term *humour*, Evans seems a more likely caricature of Jonson than Nym. He it is also who hears the Latin lesson of the little William [Shakspeare?] in IV, iii, a scene which is obviously introduced for its own sake, as it retards the action and has no connection whatever with the plot.

The evidence for the influence of *EMIH* upon *MW* is significant largely in its accumulation. From the Jonson

play in which he had recently acted, Shakspeare seems to have taken the idea for his main plot of a guller gulled, as well as for his two subordinate plots of an elopement and the cure of a jealous husband. In Stephen and Kitley he seems to have found the germ of his two best characters; and in Bobadil, the suggestion for transforming Falstaff into the stupid gull of the buck basket and beating incidents. Similarly, with regard to details, he seems to have found good-natured ridicule of such current foibles as the middle class dependence upon books of instruction, the gentlemanly habit of dabbling in poetry, and the general misuse of the term *humour*. And most importantly, perhaps because the royal command necessitated rapid writing, he seems to have used Jonson's distinctive variety of play-writing, the relatively simple intrigue plot structure and the *humour* method of characterization.

All this, of course, is not and cannot be proof. Intriguing and instructive as any study of influence may be, its conclusions without external testimony must remain in the realm of probability, in the realm of what Aristotle would term "poetic" as opposed to "historical" truth. Common sense tells us that Shakspeare was perfectly capable of writing the *Merry Wives* without the aid (or evil influence) of Jonson and that he might have found basically similar plots and characters, though hardly the accumulation, elsewhere in Elizabethan drama. But where certainty is not available, where it is as impossible to disprove influence as to prove it, the pragmatic approach to scholarship demands that we follow the evidence where it leads—and in this case the direction is clear.

¹*Every Man In His Humour* The abbreviation *EMIH* will be used throughout the article.

²George L. Kittredge, *The Complete Works of Shakspeare*, p. 63.

³The only important challenge to this date has come from Dr Leslie Hotson, in his recent book, *Shakespeare Versus Shallow* (Boston Little, Brown & Co., 1931). Having accumulated considerable evidence for identifying Shallow with Justice Gardiner, a despicable politician and ancient enemy of the Lord Chamberlain's company, Hotson contends that since Gardiner died on November 26, 1597, and Shakspeare would hardly have ridiculed a man recently deceased, 1597—probably April 23, the occasion of the Feast of the Garter—is the latest possible date.

But Hotson fails to show either that *MW* does not follow the *Henry IV* plays or that they have been incorrectly dated. Making no attempt to dispute the accepted evidence on these points, he merely states in view of his discoveries, "since it is

generally agreed that *Henry IV*, Part II, preceded the *Merry Wives*, the two parts of *Henry IV* must now be pushed back into the season of 1596-97." *op. cit.*, p. 130. . . . He refuses to recognize that if we are to assume Shakspeare's delicacy about ridiculing the dead (a point of taste in which he must have been strangely ahead not only of his own time but of the eighteenth-century satirists and Lord Byron as well) we must not casually brush aside the date evidence for three plays but direct our questioning to the identification of Shallow with Gardiner.

⁴Thomas W. Baldwin, in *The Organization and Personnel of Shakespeare's Company*, p. 236 and 240, accepts Jonson's statement.

⁵The Relation of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour*, Part II. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1939

⁶Maurice Castelain, *La Vie et l'oeuvre de Ben Jonson*, p. 224

⁷J. B. Priestley, "Falstaff and his Circle," *The English Comic Characters*, p. 69

⁸Edward Dowden, *Shakespeare A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (New York. 1881), p. 328

⁹It must be admitted that Falstaff has one redeeming feature in *MW*, his occasional witty lines. As Moore expresses it, "In action Shakespeare disgraces him, but in word, Falstaff is still a prince" John B. Moore, *The Comic and the Realistic in English Drama*, p. 202

¹⁰John Palmer, *Ben Jonson*, p. 35.

¹¹H. C. Hart (ed.), *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, p. vii

¹²According to his theoretical definition at least, Jonson seems to mean by the term *humour* not simply the dominant or distinctive trait of a character, but a trait which, like the physical humours or fluids, "wants power to contain itself." In other words, it is not the peculiarity or dominance of a trait which makes a *humour*, but the inability of the individual to control it. And the term, like the Aristotelian term *Katharsis*, is merely a metaphorical or figurative one when applied to drama.

¹⁴In the introduction to his edition of *Every Man In His Humour* (New Haven. Yale University Press, 1921), Henry H. Carter speculates hypothetically on how "Shakespeare would have employed the same material quite differently." The love motive, he says, "would have dominated the play . . . Bridget would have gained a fairer name and have been invested with all the charm of Rosalind or Juliet . . . Clothe this material in the poetic language of Shakespeare and surround it with the romantic atmosphere which only he could have created, and the play would easily become a canonical member of the Shakespearean group" (p. ciii).

¹⁵C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, I, 343.

¹⁶The essential difference between farce and intrigue comedy is that in the former most of the action results from chance, mistaken identity, confusion of time, etc., whereas in the latter it is carefully motivated and directed by a group of schemers. *The Taming of the Shrew* represents a combination of intrigue and farce. *The Comedy of Errors* in the body of the play is pure farce, but in the Aegeon framework, where a man's life is involved, it employs the high stakes and serious tone of romantic comedy.

¹⁷Elisabeth Woodbridge, *The Drama, Its Laws and Technique* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1898), p. 145. For my understanding of plot structure I have drawn heavily upon this book, as well as upon Miss Woodbridge's "Studies in Jonson's Comedy," (Boston, 1898) For a different, and in my opinion unsubstantiated, view of Jonsonian plot structure, see Edgar C. Knowlton, "The Plots of Ben Jonson," *MLN*, XLIV (1929), pp. 77ff

¹⁸*The Drama; Its Laws and Technique*, p. 145.

¹⁹Esther G. Dunn, *Ben Jonson's Art*, p. 127.

²⁰Particular interest attaches to this point because of its biographical associations. Jonson was constantly being fined or imprisoned for disturbing the peace (*EMH* was probably written during his imprisonment for killing Gabriel Harvey in a duel), and the recent discoveries of Leslie Hotson have thrown a similar light on Shakspeare. The court entry showing Shakspeare "sworn of the peace" was the clue which led to all of Hotson's investigations.

PORTIA, DANIEL, SUSANNA

Editor of the Bulletin:

It was Macaulay who put it this way: "There is no controversy so idle that it may not be of use in exercising the faculties of the disputants"

Warned too late against the danger of going into the lion's den without the divine guidance, I went in. There were no lions at all, but perhaps by divine guidance I met in the path only a gentle scholar, Mr. Withington. Said he: "Portia was not really a judge—rather an attorney—but like Daniel (who was attorney for the defence, not a judge) she was interested in seeing justice done—in rescuing the weak from the strong"

Perhaps so, but this wasn't a criminal case; one party was a leading Christian merchant of Venice, the other a Jewish money-lender, both capitalists; the case had to do with a bond Surely Portia came not as an Advocate retained by one of the parties; she came as a Judge "dressed like a doctor of laws" to pinch-hit for Bellario, a learned doctor whom the Duke had sent for "to determine this," but who reports himself as "very sick today." When she came in every one rose and bowed, the Duke told her to take her place And she took the Judge's place, saying she was informed "thoroughly" of the cause but, pretending to be a stranger to the parties, called on both parties to state their positions. Here and in what follows is exemplified court procedure according to the civil law as that procedure was daily exemplified in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Prerogative Court and in the Court of Arches in Doctors' Commons, St. Paul's Churchyard, a few steps from Blackfriars Theatre As the Italian courts

in the middle and later centuries drew upon nearby universities for approved Doctors of Law to serve as Judges in important cases, so the Ecclesiastical Courts of England, following Roman civil practice, called on Oxford and Cambridge to supply them with accredited Doctors of Law for Judges In London of the 16th century the extensive business of the Ecclesiastical Courts required resident Judges, hence Doctors' Commons; there since 1564 had lived the Doctors from the two Universities selected by the Archbishop for the canonical judicial career The famous university at Padua was not far from Venice, and Doctor Bellario of Padua was the one usually called to the court at Venice. In theory the Duke presided in that court as the Archbishop did in the spiritual court, the judgments being officially entered and enforced in the name of the Duke or Archbishop.

The setting of the stage for Act IV, Scene 1, followed the advice of one or more of the scholarly residents of Doctors' Commons, and the Portia of 1596-7 wore a Judge's robe borrowed from the wardrobe of Doctors' Commons. The wearing of a robe by the Judge was essential, and its cut, material and fashion were prescribed by rule Every one connected with the courts at Doctors' Commons wore the distinctive robe of his rank. Nothing in "The Adventures of Gianetto," from the *Pecorone* of Fiorentino of 1378, furnished a guide for the formalities of Shakspeare's Strict Court of Venice.

There was some telescoping Ordinarily cases are argued by Advocates supported by Proctors Drama required that Shylock and Antonio should each state his own case. The "lawyer's clerk" took up the slack of

Proctors and Advocates who would have slowed up the scene. You may be certain, however, that among the spectators on the stage of the Merchant of Venice, first in the Theatre and later in The Globe, were groups from Doctors' Commons, coming in on free passes, signed WS or JH.

Mr Withington says Portia wasn't a Judge at all—she was attorney for the defence. Whither will this lead us?

If Portia was attorney for the defence, she gave Shylock the early impression that he was the oppressed client she came to rescue. It is he who gives her the addition—"A Daniel come to Judgment, yea, a Daniel." (Theobald thought the text should be corrected to "A Daniel! Come to judgment! Yea, a Daniel") He adorns his Daniel with medals: "wise," "most reverend"; he honors her, he kisses the hem of her robe. Adopting the postulate and the argument of Mr. Withington, Shylock, conferring the title "Daniel" on (as he supposed) his defender, casts himself in the rôle of Susanna, the hapless victim haled into court and convicted on perjured testimony of an evil deed. Yet no one had haled Shylock into court; he was not even invited. He had crashed the gate, and in a raucous imperative voice which the tactful Duke couldn't soften, he was demanding the forfeiture of his bond and his pound o' flesh. He was not accused of anything—not yet. He had never heard of that pseudo-drama of Susanna with which the sacred Jewish text had been adulterated; the only Daniel he knew was the brave and skilful Daniel of the Hebrew-Aramaic text. After accepting her new honors from Shylock, Portia about-faces; she now warns Shylock that he will be guilty of a capital crime if he exercises the right which she has just said the law guaranteed him. The attorney

abandons the client in the midst of the trial. The garrulous Gratiano mockingly chirps up, "a second Daniel." The rôle of Susanna is transferred to Antonio—under the Withington theory. New flaws now appear. No one, not even Shylock, is bearing false witness against Antonio. The smug merchant borrowed money for a wife-hunting friend. He gives a bond, with an improvident condition, to an enemy whom he had antagonized, not to say outraged. He has neither money nor credit nor a meritorious defence. He begged for mercy but there was no mercy. There is nothing left but to rail against the Jew. Portia has come to save him as little Jewish boy. Daniel saved matron Susanna, as it is said, but little Daniel was neither a judge nor a lawyer; he was a spectator who, as convicted Susanna is being led away, makes bold to insist on asking the two witnesses separately under which tree they saw Susanna and her paramour, and when one witness said a mastic tree and the other said a holm tree, the case against Susanna collapsed, the conviction was reversed, Susanna declared innocent, and young Daniel became a popular hero. The case against Antonio collapsed when Judge Portia pronounced her decision which any lawyer will tell you was *hocus-pocus*.

My spirited and scholarly disputant belongs manifestly to the many-headed majority who, generation after generation, revere Portia as the Juno of Justice, the clear spirit of the lofty soul. In this he is a true Shaksprite, innately susceptible (like Ariel and all Globe theatre audiences) to the charm of Prospero and his magic robe.

In the Shakspeare world, however, there is room for many views. There are those who see in Portia the glamorous humbug, her De Milo figure draped in borrowed and bespattered

ermine, her tongue of culture dripping lies, as she carries out the conspiracy to extricate her new uncle-in-law from the awful mess in which her spendthrift bridgroom so irresponsibly left him. The indictment against Shylock is too long to read in full, Your Honor.

All this, however, is not to say that the Portia debunkers are not allergic to the beauty of speech and power of situation in *The Merchant of Venice*. Hazlitt did not think much of the mercy speech. No one would deny any one the right to an opinion about Portia. The argument which Mr. Withington is urging, as if it were a party line, and the argument that I think unsound, is that Shylock's calling Portia a Daniel integrates Susanna and the false witness and the Apocryphal Daniel into the play. And the assertion that all first-class commentators follow this line is questioned. Furness didn't follow it, he referred generally to all bible Daniels. Rolfe's footnote of 1880 did indeed escape me. Appar-

ently Dover Wilson is inclined to adopt Susanna's Daniel. Herford is silent. Many first-class editors, like Neilson and Kittredge, are not footnoters.

If you're someone who needs must write illuminating footnotes to Shakespeare, or you're someone who feels impelled to defend such footnoters, isn't it better not to nail your flag to a simple conjecture? Why not call attention to the Daniel verse in *Ezekiel*, the apocryphal Daniel, and any other Daniel that may or may not be relevant, leaving it to the readers to decide or not to decide, if the point interests them, as if they were audiences. Is it not a fair question also whether modern scholarship should undertake to blow-torch as an untutored heretic anyone who casts a pebble of interrogation or a glance of askance at a conjecture which someone dogmatically calls an inerrable finality?

JOHN E. HANNIGAN.

October, 1941

Vol. XVI, No. 4

The Shakespeare Association Bulletin



The Shakspeare-Bacon-Oxford-Whoozis Mixup

Ophelia Lies

Et In Illyria Feste

Scottish Shakspeare

Shakspeare's Chameleons and Salamanders

Hotspur and Falstaff

Another Medieval Convention in Shakspeare



Published by

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

601 West 118th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Incorporated 1923

Headquarters 601 WEST 113TH STREET
New York

The Shakespeare Association of America aims to unite all the lovers of the poet and to encourage and enlarge the widespread interest in his works. It will serve as a means of communication in the Shakesperian world, reporting what is being done in his honor or service, whether on the stage or in the schoolroom, in club or in university. Its purpose includes co-operation in every enterprise that will be helpful to a knowledge of the man and his works, whether scholarly, educational, or theatrical.

None of the officers or members of this organization receives any pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

The organization at present is supported solely by membership fees. It therefore earnestly invites into its fellowship everyone who has at heart the high aims to which it is devoted.

President

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH
15 East 51st St., New York

First Vice-President

Mrs. James Madison Bass

Second Vice-President

John H. H. Lyon

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Archibald Lewis Bouton, A.M.
Major Edward Bowes
Eleanor G. Clark, Ph.D.
Harden Craig, Ph.D.
Rev. Howard Duffield, A.M., D.D.
Frank Gilmors
Walter Hampden
Frank J. Hogan
Arthur A. Houghton, Jr.
George L. Kittredge, Litt.D., LL.D.
Frederick Henry Koch, A.M., Litt.D.
Fritz Leiber
Roland E. Lewis, Ph.D.
Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.

George Edwin MacLean, Ph.D., LL.D.
John Matthews Manly, LL.D., Litt.D.
Juba Marlowe, LL.D.
Herman H. B. Meyer, Litt.D.
Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, Ph.D.
Lewis Freeman Mott, Ph.D.
Wm. A. Neilson, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., LL.D.
Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ph.D., LL.D.
Aurelia Henry Remhardt, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Hyder E. Rollins, Ph.D., LL.D.
Felix E. Schelling, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Otis Skinner, A.M.
Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., LL.D.
John Thomson Willing

Treasurer

George W. Davison
70 Broadway
New York

Secretary

Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum
601 West 118th Street
New York

Board of Directors

1936

John Robert Gregg
Paul Kaufman
Robert M. Smith
Samuel A. Tannenbaum

1937

Miss Olive L. Carter
Arthur Haine
Frank L. Short
Miss Sarah A. Taintor

1938

George W. Davison
John E. Hannigan
John H. H. Lyon
Miss Charlotte E. Porter
A. S. W. Rosenbach

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Annual Membership | \$2 |
| Sustaining | \$5 |
| Life | \$50 |
| Special Life | \$100 |
| Fellowship | \$200 |
| Patron | \$1000 |

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS

ROBERT M. SMITH

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS

HARDIN CRAIG

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVI

OCTOBER, 1941

No. 4

C O N T E N T S

| | PAGE |
|---|----------------------------------|
| The Shakspeare-Bacon-Oxford-Whoozis Mixup | <i>Mark Holstern</i> 195 |
| Ophelia Lies | <i>Samuel A. Tannenbaum</i> 215 |
| Et Il Illyria Feste | <i>J. W. Diaper</i> 220 |
| Scottish Shakspeare | <i>R. Morrell Schmitz</i> 229 |
| Shakspeare's Chameleons and Salamanders | <i>James A. S. McPeck</i> 237 |
| Hotspur and Falstaff | <i>Samuel A. Small</i> 243 |
| Another Medieval Convention in Shakspeare | <i>Ernest H. Cox</i> 249 |
| Editorial Notes and Comments | <i>S. A. T.</i> 254 |
| <i>Communication</i> | <i>Robert W. Whittington</i> 256 |

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE SHAKSPERE-BACON-OXFORD-WHOOZIS MIXUP

By MARK HOLSTEIN

Yes' Shakespeare wrote the plays — 'tis clear to me
Lord Bacon's claim's condemned before the bar
He'd not have penned, "what fools these mortals be!"
But — more correct — 'what fools these mortals are!"
JOHN KENDRICK BANGS.

IT will soon be time to celebrate the centenary of "The Bacon-Shake-speare Question." "Celebrate" is, perhaps, a word ill chosen. It would seem, from present indications, that Baconians will have precious little to celebrate. The crown, which by the arduous labors of nearly a century, they have striven to remove from the head of the man from Stratford and place upon the head of their venerated idol, has been all but snatched away by a succession of British Peers. One by one the ghostly figures of these exalted noblemen have stretched out their bony hands to seize the crown. Although even Queen Elizabeth herself has been mentioned as a possible claimant, no Duke or Marquis has yet been suggested, but there have been Earls and Barons a-plenty.

Like the disconsolate Lord Tolloller of Gilbertian fame, who implores the Arcadian Shepherdess to remember that "hearts just as pure and fair may beat in Belgrave Square as in the lowly air of Seven Dials," these illustrious noblemen beseech a reluctant world to believe:

"High rank involves no shame —
We boast an equal claim
With him of humble name
To be respected"

But the world, alas! has turned a deaf ear to the claims of these aristocrats and remains serenely unshaken in its allegiance to the humble man from Stratford. But how stands it with Bacon?

The feeling of most people about the Bacon-Shake-speare Question is aptly expressed by Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who, writing to his young friend and disciple, Mr. Wu, says: "I hope you will not yield to the Bacon-Shake-

speare mystics. * * * I never have given the matter any great study but I have heard enthusiasts talk. It is one of many matters on which one must be governed by prejudices—preliminary judgments based on a knowledge admitted not to be exhaustive but on which at the peril of one's soul one has to act, as life is short. If we had eternity I suppose it might be our duty to have an articulate answer to every imbecility that can be found from the words in the dictionary. Very likely I told you of William James once asking me why I did not join the society for psychical research. I replied why don't you study the Mohometan religion. Millions of men think you will be damned if you don't join it, yet you don't bother. The answer is the same. We have to divine which is likely to be the highroad and which a *cul de sac*. We may be wrong but we have to take the risks. I put Bacon-Shakespeare and spiritualism into the same bag."

About the wisdom of the judicial admonition there can be no question, but we are not all able to remain so serenely detached. Of course it is perfectly true that if it were now definitely established, beyond all question or doubt, that no such person as Master Will Shakspeare ever lived, it would make not the slightest difference to any living person anywhere in the world. We would still have the plays and, to baffle and beguile us, the miracle of their creation would still remain.

But there is even a stronger reason for putting the Bacon-Shake-speare Question, along with other Shakspeare problems,—“Who was ‘Mr. W. H.’ or Was Shakspeare the Oscar Wilde of his day?”, “Who was the Dark Lady of the Sonnets?”, “Who was the Rival Poet?”,—to mention only a few,—into the same bag with spiritualism. It has been asserted that, next to religious maniacs, the two largest classes constituting the inmates of the insane asylums of Great Britain are those who rave about the Royal Family and those who have tried to solve the Shake-speare Problem. Since, in the United States, we have no Royal Family, the Shake-speare Problem has had a free field and, sad to tell, the first and chief protagonist in this controversy—a gifted woman, by all accounts,—died in an insane asylum.

Nevertheless, without ignoring the suggested hazard, it may be interesting to trace the history of this strange "heresy," as it has been called, which has attracted so many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of intelligent and learned people. It would be almost erring on the side of moderation to say that oceans of ink and forests of trees have been consumed, during now almost a hundred years, in making and printing books and pamphlets dealing with the Bacon-Shake-speare Question.

II.

For nearly a century after his death Master Will Shakspeare, player, play-maker, and poet was allowed to rest in peace,—which is not to say that he went unhonored and unsung. Far from it. The appearance in 1623, within seven years after his death, of the First Folio, containing not only Ben Jonson's celebrated lines on Shakspeare's portrait, but the noble eulogy, "To the Memory of my beloved, the author, Master William Shakespeare and what he has left us," and the adulatory poems by Digges, Holland, and I. M., is sufficient testimony that he was not forgotten. The Second, Third, and Fourth Folios followed within a period of sixty-two years after the First. During the same period, in 1640, appeared an edition of his poems and, as a reference to Ingleby's *Centurie of Prayse* shows, there was a steady stream of laudatory allusions to Shakspeare and his plays. Ben Jonson's avowal, "I loved the man, and do honour his memory (on this side idolatry) as much as any," is unquestioned; Milton's famous elegy beginning "What needs my *Shakespeare* for his honour'd Bones," is prefixed to the Second Folio (1632), and in *L'Allegro* Milton again refers to "sweetest Shakespeare, Fancy's child." These are but a few of the allusions during the century following Shakspeare's death.

With the opening of the eighteenth century began the revision of the text. Beginning with Rowe, a long line of editors corrected, emended, collated, and quarrelled violently over it. This continued during nearly the whole of the eighteenth century. But no one questioned Shakspeare's authorship. Then, in the nineteenth century, came the ro-

mantic critics who proceeded to make of Shakspeare not only a paragon of poets but a paragon of men,—a faultless and omniscient being,—laying the foundation for what came to be known as Shakspeare idolatry. As might have been expected, a reaction followed, and from being apotheosized as the greatest genius who ever lived he came to be denounced as an imposter.

It is no part of our present purpose to "vindicate" Shakspeare, or to enter upon a discussion of the pros and cons of the Baconian hypothesis or the claims of the anti-Stratfordians,—a name adopted by those who, while rejecting Bacon, are unwilling to accept the "Stratford rustic." Enough and more than enough has already been written on all phases of the subject to satisfy anyone who may wish to investigate the question. The most ingenious and resourceful of the anti-Stratfordians or the "agnostic" school, as it has been called, is Sir George Greenwood, M.P., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, a controversialist of no mean ability. His combats with Dean Beeching and with J. M. Robertson, also an M.P., have added not a little "to the public stock of harmless pleasure." Sir George regarded the Baconian hypothesis as "an extremely reasonable one," but has repeatedly asserted that he was *not* a Baconian. "The Baconian theory," he said, "lends itself to ridicule. It has been brought into discredit by the extreme pretensions and absurdities of some fanatical enthusiasts." Sir George therefore aligned himself with the "agnostics," whose claim it is that, whoever it may have been who wrote the plays and poems, it was not William Shakspeare, the name "Shakspeare," it is asserted, being merely a pseudonym, like "Molière" or "Voltaire," "George Eliot" or "Mark Twain." Concerning Sir George's frequently reiterated assertions that he was *not* a Baconian, Dean Beeching has cunningly suggested that "the Baconian faith peeps out in not a few places from under his cloak of agnosticism."

While the controversies between Dean Beeching and Sir George have been spirited, they have not failed to observe the amenities, but the temper in which much of the Bacon-Shakspeare imbroglio has been carried on may be gathered from the titles of many of the books and essays on the

subject. Richard Grant White, reviewing Mrs. Pott's edition of the *Promus*, entitled his essay *The Bacon-Shakespeare Craze*; Churton Collins, reviewing Judge Webb's *The Mystery of William Shakespeare*, entitled his essay *The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania*; John Fiske, to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of *The Atlantic* (Delia Bacon's book was published the same year that witnessed the birth of *The Atlantic*), published an essay entitled *Forty Years of Bacon-Shakespeare Folly*. Andrew Lang, instigated, he said, to enter the lists by Sir George Greenwood's *The Shakespearian Problem Restated*, attempted to divert the discussion into channels less acrimonious, declaring that "differences of opinion concerning points of literary history ought not to make 'our angry passions rise,'" "This controversy [he added] has been extremely bitter. * * * Charges of ignorance and monomania have been answered by charges of forgery, lying, 'scandalous literary dishonesty' and even inaccuracy."

III.

It would be interesting to trace the genesis of the idea that Shakspeare was not the author of the plays.¹ It was long supposed that Joseph C. Hart, U. S. Consul at Santa Cruz, was the first to raise the doubt in a book, published in 1848, entitled *The Romance of Yachting*. Not only Sir Sidney Lee and Mrs. Stopes but many other equally eminent Shaksperian authorities so state. However, it is now known that "Colonel" Hart, as he was called, was preceded by another and much earlier writer.

The old, old "gag"—*Who wrote Shakespeare?*—which made its first appearance almost two hundred years ago in the farce comedy, *High Life Below Stairs*, need not be seriously considered, even though Baconians have sometimes gravely cited it in support of their claim. In answer to Lady Bab's question, "Did you never read Shakespeare?" Kitty, her waiting maid, answers: "Shakespeare, Shakespeare?—Who wrote it?" Some wag has further embellished the jest by adding: "Shakespeare was written by one *Mr. Finis*, for I saw his name at the end of the book."

The only reason for mentioning this comedy at all is

that it was produced, with great success, by Garrick, in 1759, and although Garrick did sometimes commit mayhem on some of Shakspeare's plays, no other man of his time did more to popularize and honor Shakspeare. It is therefore a curious circumstance that the book which, so far as now known, was the first to question Shakspeare's authorship, and to contain a venomous personal attack besides, should have been the work of a school-fellow and intimate friend of Garrick. This strange book, published in 1769 (it is mentioned in the 14th, but in none of the earlier editions of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*) is thought to have been written by Herbert Lawrence, a surgeon and apothecary. That the book was known to Garrick, there can be no question, since a copy with his book plate is known to exist. It is called *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense: An Historical Allegory*.*

It has been suggested, and the suggestion is more than plausible, that Dr. Herbert Lawrence was a humorist and that his allegory was nothing more nor less than facetious chaff. Only a humorless Baconian could take it seriously and make it the basis for an argument in support of the Baconian hypothesis.

The allegorical story, drolly related, is that upon arriving in London, a person in the guise of Genius and Humour, makes the acquaintance of a certain individual belonging to the Playhouse, "a profligate in his youth" and by some said to have been "a deer-stealer." (Bacon is nowhere mentioned.) This individual robs Genius and Humour of everything he could lay his hands on and amongst the baggage "he presently cast his Eye upon a commonplace Book, in which was contained, an infinite variety of Modes and Forms, to express all the different Sentiments and Connections upon every Subject or Occasion that might Occur in Dramatic Writing." He also found a glass possessing "extra-ordinary Properties" by the help of which he could "penetrate into the deep Recesses of the Soul of Man—could discover all the Passions and note their various Operations in the human Heart." The manner in which this treasure had been obtained is discovered by the Mask of Humour, but no notice of the robbery is taken because it is

apprehended that to do so would be to deprive his country of its greatest ornament.

"With these Materials," Dr. Lawrence concludes, "and with good Parts of his own, he commenced Play-Writing. How he succeeded is needless to say, when I tell the Reader that his name was Shakespeare."

The book must have been widely known and enjoyed a considerable popularity for it passed through three editions. French and Swiss editions appear to have been published in 1777.

Among the many Elizabethan commonplace books now in the British Museum there is a manuscript of Bacon's which, since 1883, has been brought prominently into the discussion, as will be presently noted.

There is another curious book of the late eighteenth century, *The Story of the Learned Pig*, which contains a bitter personal attack on Shakspeare. Speaking in his own person the Learned Pig declares:

"I was early in life initiated in the profession of horse-holder, to those who came to visit the play-house, where I was well-known by the name of 'Pimping Billy.' * * * I soon after contracted a friendship with that great man and first of geniuses, the 'Immortal Shakespeare', * * * With equal falsehood has he been fathered with many spurious dramatic pieces, Hamlet, Othello, As You Like It, the Tempest, and Midsummer Night's Dream for five: of all which I confess myself to be the author."

If your curiosity is aroused because a book on yachting contains a discussion of the authorship of Shakspeare's plays, the answer is that Colonel Hart's book has very little to do with yachting. Shakspeare's authorship is dragged in because Shakspeare gave a seacoast to Bohemia. Colonel Hart nowhere suggests Bacon as the author of the plays. In the course of some rambling observations about the famed Gardens of the Hesperides, which the author says "old Purchas, an obsolete historian," made a blunder in locating, it is suggested that Shakspeare, a contemporary of Purchas (he died ten years after Shakspeare), also made a blunder, if he wrote the plays attributed to him, by wrecking some sailors "upon the seacoast of Bohemia, no part of which ever touched the sea by at least a hundred miles." After

some rambling comments on *The Winter's Tale*, and a summary of the plots of each of Shakspeare's plays, the author concludes, with no evidence whatever to support it, that these plays were found in a garret, in a promiscuous heap, and were selected by Betterton, the player, and Rowe, the writer, and, lacking an author's name, Betterton suggested "Shakespeare," which Rowe adopted, and so the plays came to be known as Shakspeare's!

IV.

The Bacon-Shake-spear dispute really got under way when, in the same year (1857), William Henry Smith published his little book, *Bacon and Shakespeare*, and Delia Bacon, *The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakespeare Unfolded*. It is true they had both been preceded by an anonymous writer (since known to have been Dr. R. W. Jame-son who, in 1852, published in *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal* an article, entitled *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* wherein it is suggested that Shakspeare "kept a poet"; but this article caused no particular sensation.

It may be worth noting that just as Joseph Henry and Samuel Morse, without each other's knowledge, were simultaneously engaged in investigations which ultimately led to the invention of the electric telegraph, and Darwin and Wallace were engaged at the same time in investigations relating to the origin of species, so apparently Delia Bacon and W. H. Smith were engaged in investigating the authorship of Shakspeare's plays. It appears that in the same year (1856) in which Delia Bacon first published in *Putnam's Magazine* her article, *William Shakespeare and his Plays: An Inquiry Concerning Them*, Smith printed in London, for private circulation, his pamphlet in the form of a letter to Lord Ellesmere entitled, *Was Lord Bacon the author of Shakespeare's Plays?* This pamphlet he later expanded into his book, *Bacon and Shakespeare*. Hawthorne, it appears, charged Smith with appropriating Miss Bacon's theory, but upon Mr. Smith's denial that he had ever heard of Miss Bacon or had ever seen her article the charge was promptly withdrawn. Smith declared that for upwards of twenty years he had held the opinion that Bacon was the author of the Shakspeare plays, and his is really the first

printed book definitely to ascribe Shakspeare's works to Bacon.

It will be seen therefore that, frequent assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, the Baconian "heresy" was really not wholly of American origin. It had its beginnings in England and, having been adopted by America, it was, like many other British products, transformed into an American fetish. At any rate it was to London that Delia Bacon, with the zeal of a crusader, went to pursue her researches. How, for three years, she lived in or near London, in shabby and unheated quarters, friendless and alone, with barely enough to sustain life; how she became obsessed with the idea that "the whole secret" concerning the authorship of the plays was contained in certain documents which were buried in Shakspeare's grave; how she haunted the places where he had lived; how she spent long hours, in the dead of night, in anxious vigils beside his tomb in the chancel of the Stratford Church; how, finally, when her ceaseless efforts to secure permission to open the grave were about to be realized, her courage failed her, lest her expectations would be disappointed, is an interesting but an unprofitable and twice-told tale.

For her book, running to 582 pages, Nathaniel Hawthorne, then our Consul at Liverpool, was induced to write a preface. Hawthorne was not a Baconian. He merely manifested a friendly interest in a cultured countrywoman who came to him recommended by Emerson. His introduction is neutral. It suggests no more than that Miss Bacon's book shows much learning and that her case is entitled to a hearing. In his *Recollections of a Gifted Woman*, which records his first and only personal interview, he gives a vivid account of her attractive and challenging personality and declares that "being conscious within myself of a sturdy unbelief, I deemed it fair and honest rather to repress than to draw her out upon the subject." "Unquestionably," he adds, "she was a monomaniac; these overmastering ideas about the authorship of Shakespeare's plays, * * * had completely thrown her off her balance."

Delia Bacon's book must be considered as anti-Stratford-

ian rather than definitely Baconian, for her thesis is that the plays were the work of a literary coterie headed by Bacon, Raleigh, and Spenser, who produced the plays in order to set forth a liberal political philosophy which they dared not openly declare.

After the appearance of Delia Bacon's book Baconian literature began to come thick and fast. The most important work immediately following Miss Bacon's, and unequivocally asserting the Baconian hypothesis, was *The Authorship of Shakespeare*, by Judge Nathaniel Holmes (not related to Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes). Judge Nathaniel Holmes has been called "the apostle of Baconianism" and his book is considered "the text book of the Baconians proper." Lee calls it "a monument of misapplied ingenuity."

Following its publication a correspondence ensued between Judge Nathaniel Holmes and James Spedding, the distinguished authority on Bacon. Mr. Spedding had devoted thirty years to the study of Bacon. He had edited Bacon's works and had published Bacon's life and letters in seven volumes. He was likewise an accomplished Shaksperian scholar. If anyone, anywhere, was competent to express an opinion as to the possibility that Bacon could have been a dramatic writer and the author of the plays, that man was Spedding. His letter to Judge Holmes is as complete and incontrovertible a refutation of the Baconian theory as anyone has made. The miracle of Shakspeare, he says, is not explained by creating an even greater miracle in uniting in one and the same person the genius of both Bacon and Shakspeare. This point is particularly emphasized by J. M. Robertson in his *The Baconian Heresy*, where he points out the impossibility of "such a miracle as the production of the 'Novum Organum' and 'Lear', the 'New Atlantis' and 'Twelfth Night', 'Romeo and Juliet' and the 'Essay on Love' by the same man, even if we consider them as forms of literary output without reference to the intellectual predilections involved"!

But in spite of its manifest absurdity, the Baconian theory attracted many intelligent and cultured people. It was said

at one time to number, in Europe and America, upwards of half a million people, including among its votaries such men as Lord Palmerston, Prince Bismarck, Lord Beaconsfield, John Bright, and our own "Mark Twain." A Baconian Society was founded in London in 1885 to develop and promulgate the theory. It published a magazine called *Baconiana*, and in 1892 a quarterly periodical with the same name was established in Chicago.

The correct use of technical legal terminology in the plays has furnished the Baconians with one of their main arguments in support of the contention that the plays must have been written by a lawyer: therefore Bacon. No doubt on this account the Bacon-Shake-speare problem has long exercised a strange fascination for members of the legal profession. Among the lawyers who have written on Shakspere's legal acquirements or the Bacon-Shak-speare Question may be mentioned W. L. Rushton, Richard Grant White, Senator Cushman K. Davis, E. J. White, William C. Devemon, and Charles Allen; and among the judges (who, as Choate once observed, are also lawyers) may be mentioned Lord Chief Justice Campbell, Lord Penzance, Judge Willis, Judge Webb, Judge Nathaniel Holmes, and Judge Stotsenburg.

Shakspere's profound legal learning and his classical learning, too, like the rumor of Mark Twain's death, have been grossly exaggerated. There are many Elizabethan plays, written by men who are known not to have been lawyers, which display a far more extensive familiarity with technical legal terms than is to be found in any of Shakspere's plays. It is hard to believe that the man who wrote the trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice* was a profound lawyer; and as to his classical learning it was pretty definitely settled by Dr. Farmer, upon whose essay Dr. Johnson made the comment: "You have completely finished a controversy beyond all further doubt."

V.

And then came the cryptographers,—deep, dark, prying, and mysterious. They found all sorts of occult figures and emblems where ordinary mortals merely found sublime poetry. If, by any possibility, the Baconian hypothesis ever

had the remotest chance of securing a respectful hearing, it was finished when these conjurers began to extract from the text cabalistic arrangements of letters and numerals in the form of ciphers, cryptograms, anagrams, and acrostics, and so reduced the Baconian hypothesis *ad absurdum*. In 1883 Mrs. Henry Pott edited Bacon's so-called "common-place book", a collection of notes and quotations made by Bacon, entitled by him *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*. Mrs. Pott, by numerous parallelisms, attempts to prove that the compiler of the *Promus* must have been the author of the plays.

One of the most industrious cryptographers was Ignatius Donnelly, an American lawyer, of Hastings, Minnesota, who, in 1887, published an enormous volume (998 pages) which he called *The Great Cryptogram*. Donnelly was followed by a long line of enthusiasts in the same field, among them, Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup, who in the preface to *The Bi-Literal Cypher of Francis Bacon*, published in 1900, states that "there is overwhelming and irresistible proof" that Bacon not only wrote all the plays attributed to Shakspeare, but all the plays attributed to Marlowe, Greene, and Peele; the minor poems and the *Faerie Queene* of Spenser, and Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, and that the cipher also reveals that Bacon was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Leicester by a secret marriage.

Then, in 1909, William Stone Booth published a huge quarto, *Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon*. This book appears to have made a profound impression upon our own revered "Mark Twain", with whom, in his later years, the Baconian theory became an obsession. Toward the end of his life this obsession took the form of writing that very feeble discourse, in support of the Baconian theory, *Is Shakespeare Dead?* He profoundly believed that Booth's book "had demonstrated, beyond any doubt or question, that the Bacon signatures were there."

At about the time the Booth book was published, *The New York Sun* was engaged in conducting a bitter campaign against President Theodore Roosevelt and published an amusing editorial on the acrostic theory of Mr. Booth. Taking Ben Jonson's ten lines "To the Reader," which ap-

pear opposite the Droeshout portrait on the title page of the First Folio, *The Sun* stated that by applying Mr. Booth's formula,—reading to the right on the first line; then back to the left on the second line; then forward, again to the right, on the third line; then back again, to the left, on the fourth line, and so on, the following acrostic is revealed:

This **F**igure, that thou here seest put,
It was fo**R** gentle SHAKESPEARE cut,
Wherein the Grauer had **A** strife
with **N**ature, to out-doo the life:
O, **C**ould he but haue dravvne his wit
AS well In brasse, as he hath hit
His face, the Print would then surpasse
All, that vvas euer vvrit in **B**rasse.
But, since he **C**annot, Reader, looke
Not **O**n his Picture, but his Booke.

But again threading these ten lines from left to right, and right to left, alternately, it is discovered they also reveal the following acrostic:

This Figure, that thou **H**ere seest put,
It was fo**R** gentle SHAKESPEARE cut;
Wherein the Grauer ha**D** a strife
with Nature, to **O**ut-doo the life;
O, could he but haue d**R**avvn**E** his wit
As well in b**R**asse, as he hath hit
His face the Print w**O**uld then surpa**S**se
All that vvas euer **V**vrit in brasse**E**,
But, sinc**E** he cannot, Reader, Looke
Not on his Picture, bu**T** his Booke

Dr. Orville O. Owen, of Detroit, also discovered a cipher in the lines opposite Shakspeare's portrait in the Folio, and declared that he hoped to discover in the River Wye, at Chepstow, indisputable proof that Francis Bacon was the real author of Shakspeare's works, as well as that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth and rightful heir to the throne. He secured the cooperation of the Duke of Beaufort to make excavations in the River Wye, but Dr. Owen's hopes were never realized.

Among more recent cryptographers may be mentioned J. Edward Morgan, whose extensive researches have brought him to the conclusion that Sir Francis Bacon was really King Edward VI. Although he may not, he adds, be able to prove it, he believes that Edward VI, Bacon and Shakspeare

were one and the same person. He believes that he has irrefutable proof that Bacon throughout his lifetime thought he was Edward VI, who is supposed either to have died of consumption or been poisoned in his sixteenth year. The fact that there would be a discrepancy of twenty-three years in the ages of Bacon as the son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann Bacon, and Bacon as the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, is explained by Mr. Morgan by stating that proof is not lacking that Bacon was twenty-three years older than he represented. This theory would, of course, make Bacon the half-brother, not the son, of Elizabeth, as some Baconians have claimed.

According to Mr. Morgan facsimiles of early folios show that the initials "F. B." were inscribed on the eyeball of the girl's head forming the principal figure in the title-emblem of *Lucrece* and that her nose was drawn from another "F. B." and that "using a bi-literal alphabet (type of two different faces)" Bacon spelled out a code message in one of his earliest folios, in five letters, in a manner somewhat akin to the Morse code of telegraphy.

"'B', in the days of the twenty-four letter alphabet," Mr. Morgan declares, "was enunciated 'Bay.' Thus, 'B-Con' in the hidden printing, and 'B' followed by a pine cone to give the pronunciation 'Bay-cone'." By such fantastic and hidden devices did Bacon embalm his authorship of the plays called Shakspeare's.

Then, extending their researches backward, the cipherers began to discover no end of mares' nests in books published in the 17th century. Among them is a book by Dr. Alfred Freund, published in 1921, entitled (as translated) "The Picture of the Spearshaker: The Solution of the Shakespeare Riddle." As its frontispiece it has the remarkable illustration of a naked man, his face turned to the reader and shaking a spear in his right hand. Dr. Freund's book deals with a book by Blaise De Vigènere, *Les Images ou Tableaux de Platte Peinture*, published in 1615, the author of which is stated by Baconians to be Francis Bacon, and reveals in words and pictures that the name "Shakespeare" means nothing more than "Speare-Shaker" (Shake-Spear) and is the pseudonym of Francis Bacon. It is also supposed

to solve the birth mystery of Francis Bacon,—that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth by her secret marriage with Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and had the right to the title, crest, and device of the Prince of Wales, as he was the first born.

Dr. Freund, in his introduction, writes:

"Bacon must have concealed the great cryptogram somewhere; probably he did it in his own words and most probably in the First Folio Edition of his Shakspeare Dramas, and chiefly in both parts of Henry IV.

The prophesy of the famous savant is now fulfilled, the great cryptogram has now been discovered.

The Shakespeare Folio Edition of 1623 contains the key, and the two plays mentioned, King Henry IV, parts 1 and 2, contain the riddle

The great secret is contained in Francis Bacon's magnificent work of revelation, entitled '*Les Images des Deux Philostrates*.' "

Another book in the same class is Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence's *Bacon is Shake-speare*, wherein he devotes a chapter to a remarkable book which is supposed to reveal the Bacon-Shakspere story. This book, published at Lunenburg in 1624, was fathered by Augustus, Duke of Brunswick, and treats of cryptography and the stenographic system of Trithemis, pseudonym of Gustavus Selenus.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence writes, "The great [First] Folio of Shakespeare was published in 1623, and in the following year, 1624, there was brought out a great Cryptographic book by the Man in the Moon." This book, Sir Edwin declares, was issued, "under Bacon's instructions," as the key to the great Folio.

"Examine first the left-hand picture, * * * You see a man, evidently Bacon, giving his writing to a Spearman who is dressed in actor's boots. Note that the Spearman has a sprig of bay in the hat which he holds in his hand. This man is a Shake-Spear, nay he really is a correct portrait of the Stratford house-holder, which you will readily perceive if you turn to Dugdale's engraving of the Shakespeare bust. In the middle distance the man still holding a spear, still being a Shake-Spear, walks with a staff, he is therefore Wagstaffe. On his back are books—the books of the plays. In the sky is seen an arrow, no, it is not sufficiently long for an arrow, it is a Shotbolt (Shakespeare, Wagstaffe, Shatbolt, of Camden's 'Remains'). This Shotbolt is near to a bird which seems

about to give to it the scroll it carries in its beak But is it a real bird? No, it has no real claws, its feet are Jove's lightnings, verily, 'it is the Eagle of great verse' "

"On the right of the title-page you see that the same Shake-spear we saw in the left-hand picture is now riding on a courser That he is the same man is shewn by the sprig of bay in his hat, but he is no longer a Shake-Spear, he is a Shake-*spur*. Note how much the artist has emphasized the drawing of the spur It is made the one prominent thing in the whole picture. * * *

"Now glance at the top picture on the title-page. Note that the picture is enclosed in the magic circle of the imagination, surrounded by the masks of Tragedy, Comedy, and Farce The engraving represents a tempest with beacon lights, No, it represents 'The Tempest' of Shakespeare and tells you that the play is filled with Bacon lights (In the sixteenth century *Beacon* was pronounced Bacon 'Bacon great Beacon of the State') * * *

In 1905 an American, Isaac H. Platt, attempted to prove that the Latin "long word" in *Love's Labour's Lost*, "Hon-orificabilitudinitatibus," is an anagram for "hi ludi tuiti sibi, Bacono nati" (These plays, originating with Fr. Bacon, are protected for themselves). Since a word containing twenty-seven letters lends itself readily to the construction of many anagrams, it is not strange that Sir Edwin should also have discovered an anagram in this word: "Hi ludi F. Baconis nati tuite orbi" (These plays F. Bacon's offspring preserved for the world). To prove his thesis, he juggles curiously with the page of the First Folio containing his alleged anagram.

But if these speculations be considered fantastic, what shall be said of the speculations concerning Ben Jonson's verses "To the Reader," where (taking each *W* for two *V*'s) the cryptographer finds 287 letters and concludes, by adding 287 to 1623 (the date of the First Folio), that Bacon intended to reveal himself as the author in the year 1910?

Of Sir Edwin's anagrammatic speculations Sir George Greenwood was moved to remark, "It is, alas, under the shadow of such things as these that I am condemned to publish the present unorthodox work [*Is There a Shakespeare Problem*] in the unhappy knowledge that all 'heretics' will be liable to be 'tarred with the same brush'."

After all this it is a relief to recall that, in a spirit of

mock-seriousness, Sir James Barrie has observed that there is a possibility that the collaborators in the plays attributed to Shakspeare were Spenser, Harvey, Alleyn, Kempe, Sly, Peele, Elliman, Atlow, and Raleigh, from the initial letters of whose names the name 'Shakspear' is obtained; and, to clear a much disputed point, he suggests that the reason the playwright's name is spelt in so many ways is that occasionally a new member joined the firm or an old member left it. Thus, when Green took Kempe's place, the name was spelt "Shagspear."

VI.

And now we come to the nobility. The fantastic claims of the acrostical school of Baconians having rendered the Baconian hypothesis not merely untenable but ridiculous, it became necessary to find someone to sponsor the plays. After all, here they were! *Someone* must have written them. If not Bacon, who? And so there appeared a succession of Elizabethan and Jacobean noblemen, who had, it is asserted, written them in secret, under the *nom de plume* "Shakespeare." Thus far there have been only four candidates for the honor—the Earls of Rutland, Derby, Oxford, and Mountjoy, each with a coterie of loyal and ardent supporters. He would be a bold prophet who would "look into the seeds of time" and dare to say there will be no more claimants. The fact that the claims of these respective noblemen are reciprocally destructive is of no moment. They agree at least in one particular, namely: that the man from Stratford could not have written the plays.

In 1912, M. Celestin Demblon, a Belgian, following in the footsteps of Karl Bleibtreu's *Der Wahre Shakespeare*, published *Lord Rutland est Shakespeare*, ascribing the authorship to Roger Manners, 15th Earl of Rutland (1576-1613); and only the other day the professor of European history and modern languages at Oglethorpe University, Dr. P. S. Porohovshikov, joined the Rutlanders with a book, entitled *Shakespeare Unmasked*. The Earl of Rutland, it appears, was the son-in-law of Sir Philip Sidney and had a part in the Essex insurrection. He was incarcerated for his share in the rebellion (1601-1603) and during his incarceration wrote the *Hamlet* of 1602. It also appears that

Rutland had pursued some legal studies at Gray's Inn, so that he would have the necessary legal equipment to supersede Bacon.

The claims of William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby, have been advocated by M. Demblon's fellow-countryman, M. Abel Lefranc, of the Collège de France, an eminent authority on Rabelais, in a book entitled *Sous le Masque de William Shakespeare*.² M. Lefranc's theory is based on a study of *As You Like It* and *Love's Labour's Lost*, which, he contends, show that Derby was the true Shakspeare because no other Englishman of that age could have given us scenes so thoroughly French as those of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

Derby's claims are also supported by Richard Macdonald Lucas in *Shakespeare's Vital Secret* and by Robert Fraser in *The Silent Shakespeare*. Stanley, it appears, was a great-great-grandson of Henry VII and was an educated and widely travelled man. He was known to be fond of writing plays, but since it was beneath the dignity of a nobleman to have any connection with the theatre, save as a patron, it was essential to conceal his propensity for playwriting. It is suggested that he therefore entered into a financial arrangement with the young rustic from Stratford, newly arrived in London, whereby the young actor undertook to act as his agent, or "Johannes Factotum." According to Mr. Lucas this hypothesis solves several hitherto insoluble Shakspeare problems, such as Davies' epigram that by becoming an actor Shakspeare spoiled his chances of becoming a companion to a king; the remorse expressed in the CXth sonnet for having made himself "a motley to the view"; and it also explains, among other things, the complete disappearance of the MSS. of Shakspeare's plays.

Sir Charles Blount, 8th Lord Mountjoy (1563-1603), has been nominated by Peter Alvor, who presents this nobleman's claims in *Eine neue Shakespeare-Biographie*, and the same author (in a book entitled *Die Shakespeare-Frage und das Ben Jonson-Problem*) declares that Francis Bacon is the author of Ben Jonson's plays.

But just now, far out in front, outdistancing all competitors, whether nobleman or commoner, is Edward de Vere,

17th Earl of Oxford. The "discovery" of the Earl of Oxford must be credited to J. Thomas Looney (not a *nom de plume*), said to be a retired schoolmaster at Gatehead-on-Tyne, England. "*Shakespeare Identified in Edward de Vere, 17 Earl of Oxford*", is the book in which the "evidence" is contained. But Oxford has found a number of other ardent champions, among them, Percy Allen, who, in three substantial volumes has expended an immense amount of study and toil in support of Oxford's claims. Of course, Oxford, like other claimants, worked in secret. His claims, in some measure, at least, rest on ciphers. His family name was "Vere", and so whenever he uses words like *ever*, *never*, *dissever*, *persevere*, *forever*, it appears that, by a slight manipulation of type, neVER, anyone will see that Oxford is intended. Since the letters VER are not uncommon in many English words, it is possible to cite numerous instances in support of the Oxonian theory.

Even science, in the shape of infra-red photography and the x-ray, has been enlisted in support of the Oxford case. Three old paintings, the famous "Ashbourne" portrait and the "Janssen" Shakspeare, both now in the Folger Shakspeare Memorial Library at Washington, and the half-length panel, now in the British Royal Collection at Hampton Court, have been "analyzed" by Charles W. Barrell, photographic expert and ardent Oxonian, who asserts that these portraits, heretofore supposed to be portraits of Shakspeare, reveal that they were at some time or other "doctored" to conceal the fact that they were originally portraits of Edward de Vere. This, if it proves anything, would seem to prove that certain portraits which are asserted to be portraits of Edward de Vere have, at some time, been altered and palmed off as portraits of Shakspeare. It would scarcely prove that de Vere wrote the plays.

Unfortunately the Earl of Oxford died in 1604, after which date several of Shakspeare's greatest plays are known to have been written. This circumstance, it might be supposed, would involve some difficulties, but it leaves the Oxonians undaunted. The Shakspeare plays, written after 1604, they explain, were the operation of a syndicate which undertook to supply plays in imitation of those which had been previously published under Shakspeare's name.

In a collection of charming and delightful papers on Elizabethan topics by that erudite Shaksperian, Dr. Felix E. Schelling, published under the title *Shakespeare and Demi-Science*, he tells us that when, in reading *Cymbeline*, the late Dr. Furness, toward the end of the play, came to the banalities of the dreams and visions of *Posthumous*, he would rise with the observation: "At this point Shakespeare lost all interest in his subject and naturally so do we." A loss of interest may long since have overtaken the Gentle Reader, and so it may be well to conclude this brief survey of the first hundred years of the Baconian heresy by recalling the two final stanzas of Dr. Schelling's amusing poem, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?*

"You may believe that Oxford, Lyly,

Rutland, or some other Willy

Writ these plays,

But you mustn't think that Bacon

Was a poet or could take on

Such bad ways

"Francis really had no eye for

Drama, what he loved was cypher,

Law — and pelf

Yet these plays got written Come now,

Could it be Will cribbed them, somehow,

From himself?"

New York, N. Y.

¹See, 'The first Baconian' by Allardyce Nicoll, *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), Feb. 25, 1932, p. 128, also 'Who was the English originator of the so-called Baconian-theory?' by Karl Elze, *Athenæum* (1885), p. 801

²For a spirited refutation of Lefranc's thesis see 'More doubts about Shakespeare', by Sidney Lee, *Quarterly Review*, July, 1919

*The author is indebted to Mr E U Maggs, of Maggs Bros, Ltd, for the information that on the back of the title-page of the copy of *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense*, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, there is the following interesting note

"This work was written by Herbert Lawrence, Esq, of York Buildings, and afterwards of Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, surgeon and apothecary. He was a school-fellow, I believe, but certainly an intimate friend, of Garrick, and very much acquainted with and patronized by Lord Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty. When I knew him he was very little engaged in business but lived in the first society. He visited my uncle daily, talking of current topics—literature, the theatre, and politics. . . He died about 1796. He published, besides this feeble work, a novel called *The Contemplative Man, or Christopher Crab*, and some fables in verse, *The Passions Personified*. J. A. Nov. 17th, 1823."

OPHELIA LIES

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

OF late there has been manifest a tendency to vilify Hamlet. His detractors ignore Shakspeare's own description of him as

The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword;
Th' expectancy and rose of the fair state,
The glass of fashion and the mould of form,
Th' observ'd of all observers

Of course, it is easy enough to dismiss this as the opinion of an unschooled and inexperienced young girl who had sucked the honey of his music vows until her suspicious and wordly-wise father and brother had put a stop to a dangerous flirtation. Does not Hamlet give free rein to his bawdy tongue in his encounters with his mother and with the girl he says he loved with a love greater than that of forty thousand brothers? Does he not desecrate the funeral service by leaping into the poor girl's grave and attempting there to strangle her brother? Has he not brutally and unfeelingly killed the watchful and loyal Polonius? Did he not, without the slightest qualms of conscience, send two innocent and lovely boys to a cruel death? Did he not, with one sweeping assertion, condemn all womankind as frail? Did he not, with malignant impiety, refrain from executing vengeance on his uncle, kneeling in prayer, because he wished to send his uncle-father's soul to hell? And did he not go about brooding, surly and sullen, only because he resented not having been chosen king of Denmark?

In conformity with this tendency, it becomes necessary to vindicate the characters of the King, the Queen, Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern, and Ophelia. The King, one critic tells us, did not commit the crime with which the Ghost charged him. The Queen, another says, was not guilty of adultery. The two young courtiers were loyally and disinterestedly performing a duty in the interests of the State when they were conveying Hamlet to England to collect the neglected tribute. Ophelia, Mr. John Corbin tells the ignorant Shaksperian editors and scholars (in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, August 16, 1941, pp. 11-

13), did not lie to her eccentric lover when he asked her "Where's your father?" and she answered (unblushingly?) "At home, my lord." Polonius, Mr. Corbin says, *was* in his own home.

The puzzled reader, recalling that in all modern editions of the play the "nunnery scene," as this scene is generally called, is located in "A room in the castle," or in "The Palace," asks himself "Has Mr. Corbin, who once wrote a little book on the humorous aspects of Hamlet's insanity, forgotten the play or has he gone hay-wire?" Let us at once set our readers' minds at rest by assuring them that neither of these alternatives has occurred. Mr. Corbin builds his case on two bases: (1) Polonius and his family live in the palace, not in a home some distance away from the royal residence; (2) a tactful little white lie ("at worst the whitest of lies") is not such a lie as should blemish a tactful young lady's character.

Those who are acquainted with the original texts know, as well as Mr. Corbin, that in the quartos and folios there are no indications of locality at the headings to the scenes in the plays. But they also know something that Mr. Corbin seems to have ignored: that the editors bring their common sense as well as their scholarship into play when wrestling with Shaksperian problems. Their common sense, as well as that of their readers for more than two hundred years, could not (and cannot) conceive that the Polonius family would be sharing an apartment or living in the same house with the King. If Mr. Corbin's view is correct, they would have to be sharing it. How otherwise would Hamlet and Ophelia be in the same room while he is meditating on suicide and she is kneeling in prayer? But can we think of Ophelia having the run of the house and the privilege of making herself at home in any room she chose to enter, or of Hamlet having the privilege of going into Ophelia's "closet" at his pleasure? Realizing the absurdity of this, Mr. Corbin thinks of the scene as taking place somewhere (a room, in all probability) "near by" Ophelia's boudoir. He does this because he cannot otherwise account for Ophelia's having Hamlet's gifts so conveniently near as to be able to offer to return them to her rejected lover. Here Mr. Corbin abandons the quartos and

folios, for he gives Ophelia an exit into her room (with a subsequent re-entry) after her father had told her to "Walk here" and had placed a prayer-book in her hand with the instruction to "Read on this book, That show of such an exercise may colour Your loneliness." The first folio gives all an exit just before Hamlet enters and begins his soliloquy, but it is obvious that the "*Exeunt*" means only that they take their assigned stations, the King and Polonius behind the arras and Ophelia in a corner in front of a prie-dieu. The quartos do not have this "*Exeunt*," clear proof that the King, Polonius and Ophelia did not leave the stage.

To one who has a feeling for language it is clear that when Ophelia says that her father is "at home" *she* is not there. If both she and her father were at home, her answer would have to be either that he is in his study, in the garden, or somewhere about the house. That the place where they now are is not Polonius's home is also proved by the fact that Hamlet exclaims "Let the doors be shut upon him, that he may play the fool nowhere but in's *own* house." If Polonius thinks he is deceiving Hamlet, he is playing the fool in Hamlet's house. That the interview between Hamlet and Ophelia is not in Polonius's home follows also from the consideration that Hamlet cannot be supposed to be going there when he wants to think.

Where does this scene take place? We recall that the King had told the Queen that he had "closely" (secretly) sent for Hamlet "hither," that he, "as't were by accident, may here affront Ophelia"; in other words, some one had dropped a hint to Hamlet that if he went to a certain place at a certain time he would see or hear something of interest. Obviously, the place must be a location in which it would not seem unnatural for Ophelia to be discovered kneeling in prayer. (The poor girl has cause enough to pray: her lover insane and she forbidden to give him audience.) Later in the day we behold the King kneeling in prayer when Hamlet is on his way to keep the rendezvous with his mother. In all probability, then, both these scenes take place in the royal chapel. Shakspeare was undoubtedly acquainted with such chapels in the palaces of the nobility. To such a place Hamlet might come to meditate, and in such a place he would not be too astonished to find Ophelia

at her devotions. In fact, he would probably welcome with joy the opportunity to have a heart-to-heart talk with her in a place where there would be little likelihood of interruption. That is why he addresses her as "Fair nymph" and prays her to remember him in her orisons.

But alas! Ophelia ruins everything by offering to return to him some "lady trifles" which she had reserved to herself when, in pursuance of her father's instructions, she had returned her lover's gifts. It would seem that Ophelia had not returned all of Hamlet's gifts after her father's admonitions to do so. Did Shakspeare intend to paint Ophelia as one of those mercenary creatures who retain some of their rejected lovers' gifts, or did Shakspeare bungle the business (as he so frequently does in minor matters)? Be the explanation what it may, Shakspeare implies that Ophelia took these trinkets with her now, without her father's knowledge, as a means of opening the embarrassing interview. Her having these "rich gifts" in her possession at this time and in this place quite naturally arouses Hamlet's suspicions; "this is not an accidental meeting" must be the thought which runs through his mind; "if this is a pre-arranged affair, Polonius is probably not far away." Being now on his guard, Hamlet engages the girl in an upsetting conversation and then suddenly throws at her the question, "Where's your father?" Caught off her guard, Ophelia unconsciously turns her head in the direction of the arras behind which the King and her father are concealed. That is enough for Hamlet. Her "At home, my lord!" does not deceive him; it infuriates him. What follows we know. This, I submit, is a much more plausible explanation of the scene than the assumption that Polonius or the King foolishly sticks his head out from behind the arras and Hamlet catches sight of him (directly or in a mirror), or that Polonius drops his staff, or coughs, or sneezes, or sticks his foot out from under the curtain.

But let us return to Ophelia. Mr. Corbin admits that Hamlet knows that Polonius is behind the arras and that Ophelia knows that he is there. She is therefore trying (clumsily, it is true) to shield her father when she says that he is at home; her words are intended to give Hamlet the impression that Polonius is not near, is not overhearing the

conversation between them. In doing this she is lying, of course. Mr. Corbin concedes that, strictly speaking, she is not telling the whole truth, but he insists that, owing to the circumstances and to the fact that she and her father live in the palace, she is guilty only of a white lie, "the whitest of lies," and that the editors of the play are the sinners, not she. Of course, no one thinks that Ophelia should have answered Hamlet's question by betraying her father's and the King's presence behind the arras. Shakspeare, in modern slang, has put her "on the spot." She has no alternative but to lie.

Mr. Corbin seeks to relieve Ophelia of the odium of being considered a liar by pointing out that she is telling the literal truth: her father is "at home" if he lives in the palace. This he calls a "white lie." But what is a "white lie"? Mr. Corbin seems to think that it is a pardonable deviation from the exact truth which is not uttered from a malicious or evil motive or one which is prompted by necessity. In real life, with its rationalized ethics, this may be so; but in art, in great art, in Shaksperian tragedy, with its idealised ethics, there are no white lies. Ophelia's lie, the reverse of the conventional "not at home," must be judged by its effects. Serious consequences result from that half truth (if it be a half truth). It disgusts and infuriates Hamlet to the point where, throwing discretion to the winds, he throws out a threat to kill the King ("Those that are married already—all but one—shall live"). That utterance determines Claudius to have Hamlet's life. Her prevarication is, therefore, responsible not only for the death of Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern but also of her father. Those few words, "At home, my lord," precipitate the action of the drama; they hasten the progress of the tragedy. Otherwise, we may rest assured, Shakspeare would not have introduced so seemingly trivial an incident. Like his other women who lack the "scientific habit in verbal accuracy" she pays for her sin with her life. And that tells us what Shakspeare the artist thought of her,—if he ever passed judgment on the children of his fantasy.

ET IN ILLYRIA FESTE

Better a witty foole, then a foolish wit.

—Quinapalus.

By J. W. DRAPER

FESTE is a fool; but, if he ever committed any folly, he has apparently long since married and learned better.

Indeed, when he settled down and took up the steady profession of fooling, he seems, if commentators can be trusted, to have turned philosopher under cover of his motley; and, for all his work-a-day gaiety, he is a shrewd appraiser of persons and something of a manager of affairs. He cultivates a lightsome mood—truly a festive fellow—and his fanciful wit gives the play an illusion of romantic unreality that seems to have blinded critics not only to its essential realism¹ but also to his own essential truth-to-life: he is the blithe stage-manager-in-chief to the *comédie humaine* of Shakspeare's Illyria; and critics have been too busy enjoying the performance he puts on to look much behind the scenes or to inquire deeply into the life and character of the manager. Ulrici finds Feste a sort of Shaksperian Democritus, adroit in merriment;² Gervinus notes how nicely he adapts both speech and action to his auditors; Ruggles describes him as a "wise, cool-headed jester", a "respector of times and persons"; and Weiss declares him the only character of true poise and "sobriety" in the play. More recently, Davey calls him "a singing, merry-making, convivial fool, yet withal somewhat of a scholar and philosopher."³ Warde is less sympathetic, and suggests that he is "covetous"⁴ and "petty",⁵ and that his nature makes him "tolerated rather than appreciated,"⁶ despite the fact that the Duke Orsino demands his presence, that Olivia is angry at his going away, and that Maria begs him to join in the guying of Malvolio. Bradley, *per contra*, explains that Feste, for all his wisdom, occupies, as court fool, a "degrading" social status,⁷ indeed "little better than a slave",⁸ and so should be excused for his valiant efforts to extract money from his betters. The new Cambridge edition repeats that he is "one of the most philosophical of Shakespeare's clowns,"⁹ and Mueschke and Fleisher compare him, somewhat distantly, to Carlo Buffone in *Every Man Out of His Humor*.¹⁰

Feste is Shakspeare's own creation, without prototype in the comedy's known sources; and, as Shakspeare's own creation, he is surely worth such study as the literary and social background of Elizabethan fools and foolery can supply. His ironic wit and word-play make the dialogue at times hard to interpret; but, unless what he says is true, his Attic salt has no savor, and so an underlying fact can be inferred even from a double meaning. Thus a serious study of the text in the light of contemporary fools and fooling brings out the finer implications that would have been obvious to an Elizabethan audience; and from such a study emerges something of Feste's biography and way of life, a good deal of his technique as an entertainer, and a juster *aperçu* of his motives, his part in the plot, and his relation to the other characters.

The background of Feste is complex: the fool was both an actual figure in the life of the age and also a literary tradition in drama; and, both as literature and in life, it had undergone a complex evolution both in England and on the Continent. The stage-fool came down to Elizabethan drama from the rôle of Vice on the Mediæval stage; and, though Feste jocularly compares himself to "the old vice . . . with dagger of lath,"¹¹ yet he has little in common with this degraded representation of Satan except the fact that both take a more active part in the plot than most clowns of Renaissance drama.¹² In the sixteenth century, the influence of the *zanni* of Italian *commedia dell'arte* and the more realistic influence of the stupid English rustic somewhat affected the stage fool.¹³ He became a sort of burlesque chorus; he is portrayed as loving fine clothes and good living; he is a practical joker, a coward and a braggart; he may be a comic lover; he is likely to be proficient at acrobatics, singing and dancing. Feste shows about half of these characteristics. He combines, moreover, the two jocular styles of the Elizabethan stage fool, rude vernacular and grandiloquent bombast; and his humorous technique borrows freely from the twenty odd devices attributed to the type, especially their use of nonsense, paradox, perversions of words, mock-Latin, comic proverbs and chop-logic.¹⁴ Of course, most of these effects are among the universal vehicles of humor current in life as well as on the stage;

and so Feste's use of them does not prove that he is purely an exemplar of this literary tradition. Indeed, several major elements of his rôle mark him off from it rather clearly. An old play lists "three kinds of fools . . . An innocent, a knave-fool, a fool politic":¹⁵ most stage-fools were "innocents", *i.e.*, half-wits or country clowns like Launcelot Gobbo; but Feste as a court fool is certainly no "innocent"; and there are "barely a dozen" court fools in all Elizabethan drama outside Shakspeare,¹⁶ and practically all of them are later than Feste. Shakspeare's fools, furthermore, are much more highly developed than those of his brother playwrights;¹⁷ and Feste's part in the plot is greater than that of the conventional stage fool.¹⁸

Feste, therefore, as one might expect in Shakspeare, stems less from the theatre than from life. Far from being a country boor, he is sophisticated, worldly-wise and even learned in a fashion; far from being an "innocent," or "natural," he appears to the consensus of opinion¹⁹ as sage and even philosophic. One should therefore seek his prototype among the fools, not of the stage, but of the courts, an ancient and time-honored, if not honorable, profession. Since the Norman Conquest, if not earlier, the English kings and nobles had employed for amusement in their households not only harmless lunatics, whose custody they got by a writ *de idiota inquirendo*,²¹ but also clever entertainers who used the cap and bells as a livelihood, and often, under the protection of its immunities, rose to considerable power.²² In the Renaissance this type grew common: such was the famous Will Somers, fool to Henry VIII,²³ and Tarleton, fool to Elizabeth. Feste had been the court jester of Olivia's noble father, who "took much delight" in him; and now, by inheritance, he has become the Countess's "corrupter of words." Not only does his witty wisdom prove his superabundant sanity, but Olivia herself assumes that he can use his "right wits" whenever he will. Such was the sort of fool usually played by Robert Armin, who was by profession both court fool and stage fool, and for whom this part was written when he joined Shakspeare's company in the spring of 1600. Indeed, as court fool, he even published, and re-published, a book on his professional colleagues and their witticisms, anecdotes

and escapades. He was doubtless the greatest living authority on court-foolery in the age; and, in creating for him the part of Feste, the dramatist surely intended to capitalize his fame as a court fool,²⁵ and bring to the common public some of the quips and cranks and practical jokes with which he regaled the great. The present study makes no claim that Feste presents the biography of Armin;²⁶ but it does suggest that the rôle of Feste, perhaps the first court fool except Touchstone to appear in Elizabethan drama, develops, not from a mere convention of the stage, but from life as Armin knew it and as Shakspeare himself saw it in Elizabethan fooldom.

What references we have to Feste's early life come from the Epilogue—if it can be taken at face value. Most critics follow either Steevens in thinking it a mere "nonsense ditty,"²⁷ or else Goodall in calling it a "philosophical" exposition of life in general; but the fact that the story it tells is phrased in the first person singular suggests that, as Farmer believed, it is a sketch of Feste's own biography. If this is true—and it is hard to contradict such *prima facie* evidence—then a brief review of its meaning is in order: when I was a child, my follies were trifles in the common course of nature; but, when I grew to be a man, I found that men shut their gates against knaves and thieves; and, when I married, I found that playing the bravo and the swaggerer brought in no money, and that drunkards merely got addled brains. Apparently, this realization led Feste to seek respectable steady employment as a court jester. Many of the famous jesters, both on the Continent and in England, seem to have sprung from humble origins. Gonella, the reputed fool of Niccolò d'Este, was the son of a Florentine shopkeeper;²⁸ the famous Brusquet seems to have started life as a quack doctor in Avignon and turned to buffoonery as more lucrative; Chicot, the fool of Henry IV, was, to be sure, a well-born Gascon, but fell through poverty to fooling; his colleague at court, Maître Guillaume, began as an apothecary at Louvain. In England, Scogan and Heywood had somehow gone to Oxford; but Somers had been servant to a Northamptonshire gentleman; Tarleton seems to have commenced swineherd as a boy; and Armin was the son of a Norfolk taylor. (Our

authorities for the above statements are the books of Miss Welsford, Mr. John Doran and Dr. Baldwin.) Feste's picture, therefore, of his knavish youth quite corresponds with the realistic facts.

From these small beginnings, Feste has risen to wealth and perhaps to power, if not quite to gentility. He is "an honest man and a housekeeper"—the house being apparently next to a church. He has enjoyed high favor under the local Count, Olivia's father, and has apparently taken unto himself considerable independence of movement so that he comes and goes almost at will. The early fools were supposed to sleep in their masters' palaces, or, as Doran shows, risk a whipping; but, for all Maria's warnings, Feste is absent for days without serious consequences. Scofula, buffoon of Borso d'Este, had a house of his own; Elizabethan jesters were not required to live at court or to wear motley; and Armin, from October 11, 1600, to his death in 1615, was a resident of St. Botolph's, Aldgate, in the City.²⁹ The Epilogue refers to Feste's marriage; and Sir Andrew, to his "Lemon." If he was married, he had good precedent both in literature and life: in two versions of the Durham morris dance, the fool has a wife; and both Scogan and Tarleton were married. Thus Feste's private life suggests that he was far from being the "slave" that Professor Bradley, without documentation, describes him and his class as being.

The exact social status that he has achieved is difficult to define; it seems, like that of Iago, to have been on the borderland of gentility; and certainly he makes common cause with Sir Toby and the gently born Maria and Fabyan against the parvenu Malvolio. Moreover, he presumes, and is permitted, to call everyone *thou*—even the Duke and Countess—except the touchy Malvolio and the drunken Sir Toby. Perhaps this is jester's license; but the others often call him by the *you* of polite equality, except Malvolio and the fool Sir Andrew. The Duke refers to him as "fellow" and "my good fellow"; and the Countess Olivia, except for one occasion (V, i, 39) when she is startled and displeased, consistently calls him *you*. All this suggests that Feste, like Tarleton and Armin, though of humble origin, had achieved

a certain recognition for professional cleverness. In the Middle Ages, the fools had been hardly better than outcasts,³⁰ and the *zanni* of Italian comedy were little more; but the Renaissance, both in Italy and in England, had seen a notable improvement in the position of court jester. The fool was likely to rule in the servants' hall; Jack Oates, the fool of Sir William Hollis, aspired to consort as much as possible with the gentry; and Archibald Armstrong, the fool of James I, who loved humor and horseplay, was once granted the freedom of the City of Aberdeen, meddled in politics, got valuable patents, and accompanied Prince Charles to negotiate the Spanish match.³¹ Feste then might properly associate with a knight, a well-born servingman and a lady-in-waiting.

Feste, moreover, is not only an artist in wit and entertainment but also in extracting its condign monetary bounty. Olivia supplies him with daily bread and "Ginger . . . hotte i'the mouth." To supplement this and pay the cost of his private residence, he levies for current jokes many an odd "testrill" (six pence) upon Sir Andrew and Sir Toby, and tribute from Sebastian, and repeated "expences" from Cesario, and double largesse of "gold" from the Duke. Thus Feste's profession of foolery was rather remunerative; and his management of it shows him a prudent and perspicacious fool. The giving of such favors was a common convention of the age; and no less authority than King James I. advised his son occasionally to cast "coin" among his pages.³² Even the Mediæval fool, who occupied a much lower plane than the fool of the Renaissance, had his gratuities: Bellzebug, in the St. George plays, gets money;³³ in *The Sage Fool's Testament*, the jester leaves his master "All my money";³⁴ and Hitard, the fool of Edmund Ironside, left his property to Canterbury Cathedral.³⁴ In France, the same is true, especially as one comes down into the Renaissance: the second fool in *Sir Manières de Fols* is portrayed as rich; Brusquet found greater emoluments in foolery than in medicine or law;³⁵ in 1622, the female fool Mathurine received a pension from the king of twelve hundred livres; and l'Angely, the jester of Louis XIV, made a fortune by his fooling. A successful court jester might live in luxury until his vein ran out, and then he might die

in want, like Bernard Bluet of the ducal court of Savoy; and this uncertainty doubtless induced many fools to make hay while they could. In Tudor England, Heywood declares in his *Dialogue concerning Witty and Witless* that a fool was better off and more secure than a husbandman; and some of the court fools drew regular salaries, such as the Marquis of Ferrara gave Gonella. The Wardrobe accounts show payments to fools; and Tarleton, who was prudent to the point of avarice, appointed guardians in his will to take care of the valuable "cattels" he left his son.⁸⁶ King James's Archie became rich, and in 1611 was granted a pension of two shillings a day for life.⁸⁷ Tarleton, moreover, was so anxious to do well by himself that, as titular parson of Sherd, he is said to have melted the parish bell to sell the metal.⁸⁸ Certainly Feste's wealth, and his efforts to get it, were in accord with the lives and characters of contemporary fools, who feared that their gala day would soon be set.

In stature, Feste seems to have been short and somewhat stout (IV, ii, 89), a token perhaps of age; but he still has a good leg, and can cut a caper and dance a jig. Whether he wore the conventional cap and bells and motley of his profession is not clear from Shakspeare's text: they are not mentioned, and it is not safe to infer them from the mere fact that he was a jester. In the days of Henry VIII, Will Somers did not always wear motley; and, in the reign of Elizabeth, fools often cast it aside.⁸⁹ Feste's declaration to Sir Andrew, "I did impeticos thy gratillity" seems to mean, as Johnson says, "I did impeticoat thy gratuity"; and that would imply that Feste wore the "long dress" of the Mediæval Vice; and possibly he also carried the Vice's dagger of lath. But perhaps Feste was merely habited in the long blue coat of the old-fashioned Tudor servant.

Feste, if not educated, at least has a bowing acquaintance with learning. He can chop logic, like the chowns in the Old French *sotties* and in Heywood's interludes; he knows something of Latin, Spanish and Italian; he refers to Mercury and the Myrmidons, and knows that Pythagoras believed in the transmigration of souls; and he has enough grasp of metaphysics to play on the axiom, "Whatever is,

is." Surely he has seen something of the quadrivium and the trivium; or else, like Shakspeare himself, he had a mother wit that needed but little formal schooling to pick up what learning he required. Quite so the actual jesters of the age, though generally low-born, seem to have taken to themselves the limbs and outward flourishes of learning: Scogan⁴⁰ and Heywood⁴¹ seem to have gone to Oxford; and Somers quoted Latin to his master. One may be sure that Queen Elizabeth and James I were no less learned in their tastes than Henry VIII.

Many fools did not hesitate to advise their noble masters even in politics, or at least took an active part in court-intrigue. The *sotties* of the reign of Louis XII had put serious satire into the mouths of fools; and Chicot gave Henry IV shrewd advice.⁴² The German fools of the sixteenth century dared even to touch on religious controversy.⁴³ Sir Thomas More's fool, Henry Paterson, tried to persuade his master to acknowledge royal supremacy.⁴⁴ Tarleton, who had the ear of his royal mistress, not only as jester but also as groom of the bedchamber, made the most of his influence at court (Doran, 175). Archibald Armstrong meddled in Jacobean politics, both foreign and domestic.⁴⁵ But Feste, for all the avarice that critics have found in him, apparently did not use his arts for politics or sell his influence for the use of others. He does not even plead the Duke's suit to Olivia, and even insists on being well paid merely to announce Orsino's visit. Perhaps Shakspeare meant definitely to imply that Feste was above such machinations; and Armin might have resented a suggestion of political intrigue as a slur on Tarleton and himself; but, more likely, this aspect of the jester's life was omitted by mere default, for Shakspeare shows little interest in politics until after the accession of James I.⁴⁶

The foregoing survey of Feste's antecedents, way of life, social status, wealth, personal appearance and probable education, shows him, like Tarleton and Armin, the usual type of Renaissance court fool, except that he did not apparently dabble in politics. It seems a fair inference, therefore, that the wit of his conversation and his actions in the play were likewise similar to the wit and the doings of Tarleton and of Armin himself. In either case, an analysis of his technique of entertainment would seem to be in order.

- ¹See the present author, "Olivia's Household," *PMLA*, XLIX, 797, *et seq.*
- ²*Twelfth Night*, ed Furness var., p. 403.
- ³S. Davey, *Trans Roy Soc Lst*, XXIII N S., 140
- ⁴F. Warde, *The Fools of Shakespeare*, New York, 1913, p. 78.
- ⁵*Ibid.*, p. 96
- ⁶*Ibid.*, p. 80
- ⁷A. C. Bradley, "Feste the Jester," *Miscellany*, 1929, p. 207 *et seq.*
- ⁸*Ibid.*, p. 210
- ⁹*Twelfth Night*, ed Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, 1930, p. xix.
- ¹⁰P. Mueschke and J. Fleisher, "Jonsonian Elements in 'Twelfth Night'," *PMLA*, XLVIII, 725-726
- ¹¹*Twelfth Night*, IV, ii, 124-126, Cf G. L. Kittredge, *et As You Like It*, xiv.
- ¹²Olive Mary Busby, *The Development of the Fool in Elizabethan Drama*, 1923, 29-30
- ¹³*Ibid.*, Chap. I.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*, Chap. IV
- ¹⁵*What Without Money*, II, ii.
- ¹⁶Busby, p. 13.
- ¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 33 *et seq.*
- ¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 31.
- ¹⁹Cf T. W. Baldwin *The Organization and Personnel of Shakespeare's Company*, 1927, p. 313 Professor Baldwin seems to be almost alone in taking Feste for a "natural"
- ²⁰Busby, p. 8 *et seq.*
- ²¹Enid Welsford, *The Fool, his Social and Literary History*, [1935], p. 159.
- ²²*Ibid.*, p. 138
- ²³*Ibid.*, p. 159
- ²⁴Baldwin, *op cit.*, Plate III; and "Shakespeare's Jester," *MLN*, XXXIX, 451-452
- ²⁵Welsford, pp. 162, 244 and 284. Indeed, playing the fool had been a commonplace of entertainers B. Swain, *Fools and Folly*, 1932, 60
- ²⁶Little is known of Armin's life except that he was Tarleton's pupil and adopted son. His stage-name was Pinks
- ²⁷*Twelfth Night*, ed Furness var., pp. 313-314, and Warde, p. 98 *et seq.*
- ²⁸Welsford, p. 128.
- ²⁹See Emma M. Denlinger, "Actors' Names in the Register of St Botolph Aldgate," *FMLA*, XLI, 95.
- ³⁰Swain, 54, *passim*. See also N. Breton, *The Good and the Bad*, ed Brydges, London, 1815, 23-4
- ³¹Welsford, *op cit.*, 171 *et seq.*
- ³²James I, *Works*, 1616, pp. 167 and 187
- ³³Swain, *op cit.*, 67-68
- ³⁴*A Booke of Precedence*, ed Furnivall, p. 78.
- ³⁵Swain, p. 55.
- ³⁶Welsford, p. 149.
- ³⁷Doran, pp. 175 and 181
- ³⁸Welsford, 171 *et seq.*
- ³⁹Doran, *op cit.*, p. 177; cf Busby, p. 47-48, and cf the avaricious cook in Dekker's *If It be not a Good Play*.
- ⁴⁰Doran, 177. Cf. p. 291
- ⁴¹Doran, p. 148
- ⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 142
- ⁴³Welsford, p. 151-152.
- ⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 139
- ⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 161
- ⁴⁶Welsford, *op cit.*, p. 171
- ⁴⁷See the present author, "Political Themes in Shakespeare's Later Plays," *J. E. G. Pb*, XXXV, 61 *et seq.*

SCOTTISH SHAKSPERE

By R. MORRELL SCHMITZ

IN her recent survey of *Shakespeare in America*, Esther Cloudman Dunn, writing of Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783), remarks (p. 224) that

"the entrance of Shakespeare into the conservative American stronghold of traditional [classical] education, under the respectable ægis of Hugh Blair, is one of the pleasant little jokes of our history."

The joke is a little thin, and is based upon the notion that the person least likely to show us Shakspeare as "great" and "instructive" and "touching the heart," would be a Scotch Presbyterian preacher.

The Rev. Hugh Blair (1718-1800) was a Scotch Presbyterian preacher; he held the most fashionable pulpit in Edinburgh, and he was a man of power in the councils of the church. But he was as far removed as possible in temperament, learning, and doctrine from the soul-searching, salvation-preaching, and theater-damning evangelicals of his day. His ideas of the good life were based upon rational morality rather than Calvinist doctrine. And his notions of the full life are best comprehended in the motto of his friend, the Rev. William Robertson—*Vita sine literis mors*.

A life of letters was meat, drink, and reputation to Blair, as also to his clerical friends, who were known as the "Moderates," as opposed to the "Evangelical Party" in the Scottish kirk. The historians Adam Ferguson, William Robertson, and Robert Watson, the philosopher Thomas Reid, the poets Beattie and Blacklock, and the dramatist John Home, to mention only a few—all clergymen of the Scotch Presbyterian church—gave a distinct cultural and literary character to the Scottish divines in the Eighteenth century. These men, friends and acquaintances of Blair, are to be remembered as quite distinct from the evangelical Bostons, Erskines, Gillespies, or the ranting preachers of Burns's *Holy Fair*.

It is only upon this minor point that I have the least quarrel with Professor Dunn's survey. Her chief observation (p. 225), so far as Blair is concerned, is that his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* brought the study of Shakspeare, "unchallenged, into the educational scheme of America." That point is well and properly made. But Professor Dunn's work, being the most recent book which mentions Blair and Shakspeare in the same breath, offers itself as the latest example of a strange and persistent omission—the failure to mention that Blair, besides being a critic of Shakspeare, is also an editor of Shakspeare.

Augustus Ralli, in *A History of Shakespeare Criticism* (1931), Robert W. Babcock, in *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry* (1932), and now Professor Dunn, have given able surveys of their respective problems, historical and critical. They have all mentioned Blair and Shakspeare together, but strangely enough they seem oblivious of the fact that in 1753 Hugh Blair published an eight-volume edition of the plays, and was the first Scottish editor of Shakspeare. Ralli and Professor Dunn completely ignore the fact, and Babcock has so well submerged it that only a very careful searcher—working independently of the index—will find it out. The libraries all seem to know about this edition, Jaggard's *Shakespeare Bibliography* recognizes it, and I have found mention of it even in reasonably strange places, such as Professor Tinker's edition of Boswell's *Letters*, and Margery Bailey's edition of *The Hypochondriack*. How it has escaped, or why it has been so completely ignored where one would most expect to find mention of it, is very strange.

It is therefore my purpose to present a discussion of Blair's *Shakespeare*, which was often reprinted and which enjoyed a wide circulation during the eighteenth century. Unfortunately, the discussion must proceed almost entirely from the edition itself, for, to put it plainly, the entire information concerning Blair's part in producing the edition hangs upon two printed lines from the year 1795. Until then his work was known merely as the "Scots Editor's" *Shakespeare*.

Only after the work had gone into its fifth edition was the

"Scots Editor" publicly identified as Blair. The identification was acknowledged by printing on the verso of the title-page of the 1795 Edinburgh edition the legend:

"This edition of Shakespeare is correctly printed from the famous edition 1753, by Dr. Hugh Blair."

Without this legend, Blair's work as an editor of Shakspeare might never have come to light. None of Blair's biographers mentions the work.¹ None of his contemporaries, so far as we know, alludes to it. And none of Blair's own letters—not even when he is writing to Mrs. Montagu about Shakspeare—gives the slightest hint that he had ever undertaken such a work. The fact hangs merely upon the two printed lines, though the identification of the "Scots Editor" is entirely proper, and is now commonly accepted.²

It is perhaps not far to seek why Blair remained anonymous. He was still in his early thirties. He was inexperienced. And he was at the command, as it were, of Alexander Kincaid and other Edinburgh booksellers who wanted a good cheap edition to compete with the London publishers. Under the circumstances, Blair either resolved upon anonymity, or was persuaded to it by the publishers, who would—for their purposes—prefer patriotically to announce a "Scots Editor." A brief look at the trade conditions will show us precisely what was called for.

In London the two Jacob Tonson's—uncle and nephew—exercised a virtual monopoly over the publication of Shakspeare from Rowe's edition (1709) onwards. They published at "Shakespeare's Head," and they considered the poet their private property. So long as the Tonson's had the market under thumb, nothing much was done about issuing cheap editions. In the year 1734, however, the first low-priced editions came into being, and with them the first real competition. The publishers at "Shakespeare's Head" made phenomenal headway by issuing separate editions of each play so cheap that they could be hawked about the countryside by peddlars. Almost immediately a rival publisher, R. Walker, also using the name "Shakespeare's Head," issued similar printings, and set out to capture what he could of the lucrative Tonson business.³

There were charges of piracy, and there were lawsuits, but

the chief battleground was the peddler's pack and the provincial bookstall. The market outside of London was worked for all it was worth, and the competition finally pushed as far north as Scotland. This put the Scottish publishers on their mettle as tradesmen, and their answers were Scottish editions, two of which sprang up almost simultaneously at Glasgow and Edinburgh in 1752 and 1753.

Blair's edition itself gives ample evidence that it was promoted for the trade. The motives for the undertaking, writes the "Scots Editor," were

"the distinguished character of Shakespeare as a dramatic writer, the great demand for his works among the learned and polite, and a laudable zeal for promoting home manufactures" (Preface, 1795, I, 1).

The work was apparently to be brought to the attention of the public by its promise to unfold the "Beauties" of the bard, as indicated in the full title

The Works of Shakespear In which the Beauties observed by Pope, Warburton, and Dodd, are pointed out Together with the Author's Life A Glossary, Copious Indexes, and, A List of the Various Readings

The "Beauties" of Pope and Warburton are indicated in Blair's text by single and double inverted commas, and the "Beauties" observed by "Macaroni" Dodd are placed together in a prefatory section of Volume I. The "Beauties" were, furthermore, carefully indexed in two sizeable lists at the end of Volume VIII, where appear an "Index to the Characters, Sentiments, Speeches, Descriptions, and Similes," and an "Index to the Beauties of Shakespear, digesting them under proper heads"⁴. Such concerns were obviously intended for the talking points in selling the work.

In other ways also the work was a good edition for the trade. The format was well designed, the page compact without being crowded, and the type good. The edition carried Alexander Pope's critical preface, Rowe's *Life of Shakespeare* and William Warburton's critical estimate of the plays. It was issued as an inexpensive edition at £1 4s the set, or 3s the volume.⁵

Blair was by no means entirely the creature of the booksellers, whose advice would extend no further than the ob-

vious and the superficial. Blair was an editor in his own right, and, in point of time, the sixth modern editor of Shakspeare. He was preceded by Rowe (1709), Pope (1725), Theobald (1734), Hanmer (1744), and Warburton (1747), upon all of whom he drew variously in the preparation of his text. With their attitudes towards Shakspeare and themselves, however, he had no patience.

In the "Scots Editors Preface" Blair is of opinion, with William Dodd, that all these editors, instead of having put themselves "in a posture of defense one against another," should have "jointly taken the field, and united all their efforts, to rescue so inimitable an author from the Gothic outrage of dull players, duller printers, and still duller editors."⁶ It was Blair's hope to follow this hint, and since all the previous editors save Warburton were dead, to prepare from their editions a sort of coalition text. "We have," wrote Blair,

"consulted them all, and, of the various readings and conjectures, those only have been adopted, and inserted in the text, that seemed to agree best with the meaning of the author. No scope has been given to conjecture or imagination, not a single line, not even a single word, is inserted, but what is warranted by the authority of the preceding editors" (Preface, 1795, I, vi.)

This is a very fair statement of what Blair did, and reflects the attitude of mind which should have produced a variorum text.

If Blair denied himself conjecture and imagination, he spared no pains in industry. His list of preferences among the various readings concerned itself with approximately 1,000 disputed passages, and gives some 3,000 to 4,000 variant readings. Aside from consulting the modern editors, Blair also consulted what he calls the "Common Editions," though he had as little respect as Warburton for their findings. The "Common Editions" were the seventeenth century folios, and Blair's abbreviation for them was "V," a hint he had taken directly from Warburton's edition where the folios are called the "Vulgar" editions.

In fact, it was upon Warburton's *Shakespeare* that Blair depended most heavily. Two out of every three readings which Blair adopted in preparing his text were the readings

of Warburton, with Theobald and Hanmer running a poor second and third. A sample of Blair's adoptions among the disputed readings of the first five plays in the Scottish edition, shows Blair approving

- 125 readings by Warburton,
- 49 by Theobald,
- 11 by Hanmer,
- 3 from the "Common Editions," and
- 1 from Dodd.

Rejecting

- 1 reading by Warburton,
- 5 by Theobald,
- 6 by Dodd,
- 6 by Hanmer, and
- 120 from the "Common Editions."

A similar dependence is shown in a more elaborate collation of Blair's readings for *Romeo and Juliet*, made independently of Blair's acknowledged choice, and assuming what is not true, that he had examined all the known editions of *Romeo and Juliet*. Of the twenty-seven passages which Blair considers in the play, his eventual choice shows

- 1 reading from the first Quarto,
- 3 from the second Quarto,
- 3 from the third (undated) Quarto,
- 3 from the first Folio,
- 3 from the second Folio,
- 3 from the third Folio,
- 3 from the fourth Folio,
- 3 from Rowe,
- 2 from Pope,
- 7 from Theobald,
- 12 from Hanmer,
- 25 from Warburton, and
- 3 from Dodd's *Beauties of Shakespear*.⁷

The dependence upon Warburton is obvious in the text. Warburton also supplied Blair with most of the explanatory footnotes, which are generally condensations, and often word for word quotation from the edition of 1747.

In the light of Shaksperian criticism, Blair's dependence upon Warburton was not too happy, but one can hardly wonder that the young Edinburgh clergyman should bow before the opinions of the man whose critical reputation was perhaps the highest in Britain, and who would soon

become the Bishop of Gloucester. Whenever Warburton's edition provided Blair with a "reasonable" reading he adopted it. He also adopted generally Warburton's notions about what part of the text were interpolations or, as he called them, "players' trash." One amusing example of how Blair treated such a disputed passage, shows his utter dependence upon authority, as well as the difficulties he ran into from time to time trying to make his authorities coalesce.

Pope and Warburton, it will be recalled, degraded to the bottom of the page such passages as they held suspect, or thought to be interpolations. Blair, following their examples, degraded as unworthy of Shakspeare seven passages from *Romeo and Juliet*. One of these passages was Capulet's angry speech to the saucy Tybalt, dismissing him with "You are a princox; go!" That passage must have given Blair particular pause. Pope had ruled it out of the text as an interpolation. Warburton had, however, thought it very fine, and had blessed it with the double commas, insignia of the "beauty." Blair, faced with this dilemma, degraded the passage in obedience to Pope, but printed the degraded passage in all the glory of its double commas.

Blair's text was indeed a coalition text, and, though a good text, had as its chief virtue the promotion of "home manufactures." Blair had achieved an excellent product, which sold well for almost half a century in Edinburgh, Glasgow and London, being reprinted in 1761, 1769, 1771, and 1795. The printing of 1771 was dedicated to David Garrick, and was the finest of all the printings. Blair had met Garrick and had had much conversation with him in London during the year 1768, and it is probable that either he or Boswell wrote the dedication which was issued as if written by the publisher Alexander Donaldson.³ Some years later Blair presented a copy to Robert Burns who visited Edinburgh in 1787.⁹ All in all, Blair's edition was what the publishers of the 1795 printing called it, "the famous edition of 1753, by Dr. Hugh Blair."

Whether or not Blair's *Shakespeare* of 1753 was the first Scottish edition, I leave to the hair-splitters. Jaggard gives

preference to an edition of the separate plays which appeared serially in Glasgow from 1752 to 1757 and were reprints from Pope's second edition. In point of time the Edinburgh edition is second, but there is no doubt that Blair is the first "Scots Editor" of Shakspeare.

*Columbia University,
New York.*

¹There is one exception. Blair's work is mentioned in a badly informed and happily obscure article, "A Litterateur of the Eighteenth Century," appearing in a collection entitled *Cross Lights* (London, 1888), pp 100 ff. This anonymous article informs us, wrongly, that Blair had the supervision of "an edition, in ten volumes, of the 'Plays and Poems of Shakespeare,' issued by Martin and Wotherspoon." The entire article is a mass of misinformation about Blair, and would never have come to light except for the excellent analytical cataloguing of the Harvard librarians.

²See *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*, Jaggard, *Shakespeare Bibliography*, Boswell's *Letters*, ed C. B. Tinker (Oxford, 1924), I, 185, Boswell's *Hypochondriack*, ed Margery Bailey (Stanford, Calif, 1928) II, 220.

³See Sidney Lee, *A Life of William Shakespeare* (New York, 1924), p 574.

⁴Edition Edinburgh, 1753, VIII, 310-333, 334-344.

⁵The announcement in the *Scots Magazine*, XV, 368 July, 1753) reads. "*The Works of Shakspeare* 8 vols 12mo 1 £ 4 s Sands, Hamilton & Balfour, Kincaid & Donaldson, Hunter, Yair, Gordon, and Brown."

⁶Quoting Dodd in "Scots Editor's Preface" (Edinburgh, 1795), I, v-vi.

⁷Blair probably had no access to any of the Quartos, and the collation fails to disclose which, or how many of the Folios he used.

⁸A. F. Pottle, *The Literary Career of James Boswell* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 86-88, believes that Boswell, then theorizing about dedicating plays to players, had written the dedication for Donaldson. Blair is quite as probable an author, although the style is somewhat below his standard.

⁹For the Garrick and Burns copies, see under *Works of Shakespeare*, 1771, in Jaggard's *Shakespeare Bibliography*.

SHAKSPERE'S CHAMELEONS AND SALAMANDERS

By JAMES A. S. MCPEEK

AMONG hundreds of amorous ditties circulated in Elizabethan England, some of them veritable museums of odd figures of speech, none is more curious than George Turberville's "To his Mistress, declaring his life only to depend on her looks," included in his *Epitaphes and Sonnettes*.¹ This lyric, in which the author compares himself variously to a salamander, a fish, and a chameleon, was doubtless accepted as excellent love poetry in its day. It is of interest to us at present because Shakspeare, for one reason or another, thought it good enough to memorize.

His interest in the poem was possibly twofold; as a youth, he may have found its sentiment appealing, as did the galants who persuaded Turberville to write poems of this nature for them to use in their love affairs,² and he may have been pleased with its salamanders and chameleons, those creatures that have a strange immortality in the imagination. One cannot remember not knowing of these animals. Their legends trace to remote antiquity, and an oral tradition must always have been current about them, now and then finding expression in literature. Many today were tutored by Samuel Merrick's version of the chameleon myth, and it is pleasant to think that Turberville's poem performed a like service for Elizabethan youth.³ However that may be, Shakspeare was interested in all aspects of the lyric save one, that of the comparison of the lover to a fish.

In *Henry IV*, Part I, Falstaff delivers the following peroration on Bardolph's nose (III, iii, 41-43):

"I have maintained that salamander of yours with fire any time this two and thirty years, God reward me for it!"

Turberville declares that he, like the salamander, cannot live unless his mistress maintains his fire (ll. 21-22):

"I silly salamander, die
if you maintain not friendships fire."

One may think the resemblance here in diction a mere co-

incidence,⁴ but an examination of other related passages convinces one that Shakspeare knew Turberville's poem well enough to recall it with precision at discrete periods of his life.

He plays with the same theme in *Henry V*, once more in connection with Bardolph, with an added element from the lyric. Falstaff's erstwhile page has reminded Bardolph of his master's jesting about his nose, and Bardolph rejoins (II, iii, 41-42) :

"Well, all the fuel is gone that maintain'd that fire That's all the riches I got in his service."

Fuel is also mentioned in Turberville,⁵ though the resemblance is inconsequential. More to the point is the idea of riches gained in service (ll. 39-44) :

"Love is the only livery that
I at your courteous hand do crave
I do desire no greedy gaine,
I covet not the massye golde:
Embrace your servant, (mistres) then
his wages will be quickly told."

Here the relationship is admittedly one of thought rather than of diction; but, as will become evident, the thought is a reflection of an earlier use of the diction of Tuberville.

If Shakspeare knew this poem well enough to recall its salamanders presumably he would remember its chameleons; and one is at once reminded of his use of the figure in *Hamlet* (III, ii, 93-96) :

King. How fares our cousin Hamlet?
Hamlet. Excellent, i' faith; of the chameleon's dish.
I eat the air, promise crammed; you cannot feed capons so.

In this connection, however, through the very commonness of the figure, the evidence is at first less obvious. In 1600 Samuel Rowlands had introduced this image in the seventeenth epigram of his *Letting Humours Blood* :

"Can men feede like camelions on the ayer."⁶

There is clearly little to choose between this parallel and that of Turberville. But Shakspeare had used this figure earlier than Rowlands, in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*,

in lines that offer sufficient background for the *Hamlet* passage and that also connect the figure with the sentiment of Turberville. Speed has no sympathy with his master's dining on love (II, i, 178-180):

"Ay, but hearken, sir; though the chameleon Love can feed on the air, I am one that am nourish'd by my victuals and would fain have meat. O be not like your mistress; be moved, be moved."⁷

Shakspere's audience must have caught this jocose allusion to a familiar poem (ll. 9-10, 25-30):

"Chameleon feedes but on the ayre,
the lack whereof is his decay.

You are the pleasant breathing ayre,
and I your poore Chameleon,
Barre me your breath and out of hand
my life and sweet delight is gone.
Which sith tis so (good mistresse) then
doe save my life to serve your turne."

One other aspect of the chameleon, its ability to change color, engages Shakspere's attention in this play.⁸ To this phenomenon Turberville alludes casually, and Shakspere probably associated his account with oral tradition. In developing this motive, he gives us a remarkable adaptation of the thought of the lyric. The scene is one of badinage between Silvia, Valentine, and Thurio. It opens conventionally with diction that becomes significant only in the light of what follows (II, iv, 1-2, 8-13, 23-29, 33-40):

Sil. Servant!

Val. Mistress?

Sil. Servant, you are sad.

Val. Indeed, madam, I seem so.

Thu. Seem you that you are not?

Val. Haply I do.

Thu. So do counterfeits.

Val. So do you.

Sil. What, angry, Sir Thurio! Do you change colour?

Val. Give him leave, madam; he is a kind of chameleon.

Thu. That hath more mind to feed on your blood than live in your air.

Val. You have said, sir.

Sil. A fine volley of words, gentlemen, and quickly shot off.

- Val.* 'Tis indeed, madam, we thank the giver.
Sil. Who is that, servant?
Val. Yourself, sweet lady, for you gave the fire Sir Thurio borrows his wit from your ladyship's looks, and spends what he borrows kindly in your company.
Thu. Sir, if you spend word for word with me, I shall make your wit bankrupt
Val. I know it well, sir; you have an exchequer of words, and, I think, no other treasure to give your followers, for it appears, by their bare liveries, that they live by your bare words.

This verbal bandying is interrupted by the approach of Silvia's father, or even the lake-loving fish that fills up the trinity of Turberville's impersonations might have passed the flood-hatches⁹ of Shakspeare's wit; for nearly everything else is here.

For convenience of comparison, I repeat the pertinent lines of Turberville:

"The salamander can not live
 without the help of flaming fire:
 Chameleon feedes but on the ayre,
 the lack whereof is his decay
 I silly salamander die,
 if you maintain not friendships fire:
 Quench you the coale and you shall see
 me pine for lack of my desire.
 You are the pleasant breathing ayre,
 and I your poore Chameleon,
 Barre me your breath and out of hand
 my life and sweet delight is gone.
 Which sith 'tis so (good mistresse) then
 doe save my life to serve your turne:
 Rewe on my case and pitie him
 that swears himself your servant true.
 I beare the badge within my breast
 wherein are blazde your colours brave:
 Love is the only livery that
 I at your courteous hand do crave
 I do desire no greedy gaine,
 I covet not the massye golde:
 Embrace your servant (mistress) then
 his wages will be quickly tolde"

Because of Shakspeare's transformation of Turberville's

thought, the connection between some passages in the scene and the poem may be somewhat murky in places, but it is clear enough in general to need no further elaboration. Even the title of Turbervile's lyric is implicit in Valentine's remark that Thurio borrows his wit from Silvia's looks.

With this scene the circle is complete. In *Henry IV*, Part I, we have the idea of the salamander maintained with fire; in *Henry V*, the same theme with the association of wages and service; in *Hamlet*, the air-feeding chameleon, apparently related to the chameleon metaphors in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*; and finally, in this latter play, the chameleon theme linked with color, love, fire, wages, the livery of service, and the conventional, but topically significant terms, *mistress* and *servant*. The welding of the several themes of the lyric in this play, and their subsequent dispersed treatment elsewhere with close approximation of the original diction indicate that Shakspeare must have memorized Turbervile's poem.

*University of Connecticut,
Storrs, Connecticut.*

¹This short collection of miscellaneous verse, which bore the characteristic title, "*Epitaphes and Sonnettes annexed to the tragical histories, By the Author. With some other broken pamphlets and Epistles, sent to certain his friends in England, at his being in Moscovia. Anno 1569*", was first published c. 1574, along with the *Tragical Tales, translated by Turbervile, In time of his troubles, out of sundrie Italians* ("New Facts about George Turbervile", by Hyder E. Rollins, *Modern Philology*, XV (1917-18, pp. 136-139). The only early copies of this work are those of the 1587 edition which was reprinted at Edinburgh, 1837, by James Maidment, whose text is followed here (see p. 298).

²Rollins, p. 142.

³The most notable of documents using the chameleon figure, Buchanan's well-known prose satire, *Chameleone*, directed against the Laird of Lidington, written in 1570, seems not to have been printed before 1710 (*Vernacular Writings of George Buchanan*, ed. P. Hume Brown, Scottish Text Society No. 26 [Edinburgh, 1892], p. 40). Its nature was remarked by Camden in his *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha*, Part II, 1573 (published 1615).

⁴The basic idea was, of course, commonly known. A passage in Greene's *Tritameron of Love*, III, 142, "Plinie . . . saith, the Salamander delighteth in the fire" (*First Part of King Henry the Fourth*, ed. R. P. Cowl and A. E. Morgan, Arden ed. [London, 1914], p. 133) points to the general source for such lore.

⁵Cf. lines 23-24 "Quench you the coals and you shall see
me pine for lack of my desire"

⁶This parallel is cited by Edward Dowden (*Hamlet*, Arden ed. [London, 1919], p. 133); see *Letting Humours Blood*, Epigram 17, London, 1600 (*Complete Works of Samuel Rowland*, ed. S. J. H. Herrtage, Hunterian Club, no. xx, 1874, p. 23).

⁷A parallel from Lyly's *Endimion*, III, iv, 129,

Love is aameleon which draweth nothing
into the mouth but aye";

has been noted by R. Warwick Bond (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Alden ed. [London, 1906], p. 28)

⁸This idea also occurs in *Henry VI*, Part III, III, ii, 191-192.

"I can add colours to the chameleon,

Change shapes with Proteus for advantages"

Mr H C Hart (*The Third Part of King Henry the Eighth*, Arden ed., [London, 1910]) calls this reference to Proteus a *hapax legomena*, ignoring the fact that Shakspeare also designated his chameleon-like character in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* by that name

⁹The figure is Turbervile's, slightly altered (ll. 5-8, 17-20):

The little fish doth love the lake
dame Nature hath assigned him
To live no longer than he doth
amid the silver channel swimme

I am the fish, you are the floode,
my heart it is that hangs on the hooke:
I cannot live if you doe stoppe,
the floudhatch of your friendly brooke."

It is odd that Shakspeare excludes these lines, for he is not altogether adverse to the central image of the lover as a fish caught on a hook (*Antony and Cleopatra*, II, v, 10-15).

At least one writer of the time (probably Francis Davison) seems to have liked this part of the poem as well as the rest. A few lines from his lyric with the Turbervilian title, "That all other Creatures have their abiding in heaven, hell, earth, ayre, water, or fire, but he is in all of them" [*A Poetical Rhapsody* (1602-1621), ed H E. Rollins (Cambridge, 1931), I, 88, No 39, Ode VIII (ll 5-8, 16-20)].

"With finnes the people gliding,

Of Water have th' enjoying.

In Fire (all else destroying)

The Salamander findes a strange abiding.

Th' ill foode of auncie sighes my life sustaineth
To Streames of teares still flowing
My weeping Eies are turned,
My constant Heart is burned
In quenchlesse fire within my bosom glowing."

The chameleon is not named here, although the author has him in mind. Elsewhere he names him in verses equally indebted to Turbervile (Rollins, p. 66, No. 22, ll. 1-8):

"Since your sweete cherry lippes I kist,

No want of foode I once have must

My stomach now no meate requires,

My throate no drinke at all desires

For by your breath which then I gained,

Camelion like my life's maintained

Then grant me (Deere) those cherries still,

O let me feede on them my fill."

HOTSPUR AND FALSTAFF

By SAMUEL A. SMALL

AS in other great Shaksperian characters, one sees an antithetical strain in Hotspur. Contrasted with his strength of mind, his noble temper, and his excessive ambition, are his expressions of contempt for everything sentimental and delicate. He represents a chivalrous type of manhood, but is bourgeois in his relationship with others in *Henry IV, Part I*. As blunt in his language as he is in his adventurous military actions, he is in society coarse-minded, like Falstaff and Prince Hal, but without the social wit of this pair. When we see Hotspur conducting business with Worcester, Glendower, and others, we find him using language similar to that of Falstaff, but lacking the tavern atmosphere. Hotspur's language is not only out of accord with the high temper of his mind, and with business circumstances, but is also often unbecoming to his domestic life in the presence of his wife. He has a wasp-tongue, and is jerky in his actions as well as in his speech. A passage in *Henry IV, Part II*, describes his defect of speech:

And speaking thick, which nature made his blemish (II, iii, 24)

Since Hotspur is recorded in history as a chivalrous figure (see Froissart), his language in Shakspeare indicates that the playwright was deliberately giving to this doughty fighter the usual humanizing touch. Like Falstaff, he represents a decayed form of chivalry.

The opinions of others in the play concerning Hotspur's language bring out strongly the Falstaffian-like tendencies in his speech. These opinions show him to be as immoderate in his language as he is in his courage.

Worcester: He apprehends a world of figures (I, iii, 209)

Northumberland: Why, what a wasp-stung and impatient fool
Art thou to break into this woman's mood.

(I, iii, 236-237)

Lady Percy: Come, come, you paraquito, answer me (II, iii, 90).

Mortimer: Come, come, no more of this unprofitable chat
(III, i, 63)

Worcester. In faith, my lord, you are too wilful-blame (III, i, 176).
 (This whole passage of 13 lines wains him of his manners and language.)
Lady Percy. For you are altogether governed by humours
 (III, i, 239).

The expressions themselves from the lips of Hotspur are those of a braggadoccio nature; they savor of the tavern. The following utterances are numerous enough to reveal Hotspur as a man whose high, aristocratic birth contrasts much with his commonplace language:

1. To be so pestered with a popinjay. (I, iii, 50)
2. God save the mark. (I, iii, 56)
3. This villainous salt-petre. (I, iii, 60)
4. This bald unjointed chat of his. (I, iii, 65)
5. And if the devil come and roar for them (I, iii, 125)
6. 'Zounds'. (I, iii, 131)
7. the hangman. (I, iii, 166)
8. If he fall in, good night! Or sink or swim! (I, iii, 194)
9. To pluck bright Honour from the pale-faced moon.
 (I, iii, 202)
10. And pluck up drowned Honour by the locks. (I, iii, 205)
11. By God, he shall not have a Scot of them. (I, iii, 214)
12. Save how to gall and pinch this Bulingbroke. (I, iii, 229)
13. And this same sword-and-buckler Prince of Wales.
 (I, iii, 230)
14. I would have him poisoned with a pot of ale. (I, iii, 233)
15. *Wor*. When you are better tempered to attend. (I, iii, 235)
16. A plague upon it (I, iii, 243)
17. 'Sblood! (I, iii, 247)
18. Why, what a candy deal of courtesy
 This fawning greyhound then did proffer me! (I, iii, 251-2)
19. O, the Devil take such cozeners! God forgive me!
 (I, iii, 255)
20. I smell it. (I, iii, 277)
21. Why that's certain. 'tis dangerous to take a cold, to sleep, to
 drink; but I tell you, my lord fool, out of this nettle,
 danger, we pluck this flower, safety. (II, iii, 9-12)
22. Say you so, say you so? I say unto you again, you are a
 shallow cowardly hind, and you lie. (II, iii, 12)
23. What a lack-brain is this! (II, iii, 12)
24. By the Lord, our plot is a good plot as ever was laid.
 (II, iii, 13)
25. What a frosty-spirited rogue is this! (II, iii, 16)
26. 'Zounds, an I were now by this rascal, I could brain him with
 his lady's fan. (II, iii, 18)
27. What a pagan rascal is this! An infidel! Ha! (II, iii, 23)
28. A dish of skim milk. (II, iii, 26)
29. Hang him! Let him tell the king. (II, iii, 37)
30. Away, you trifler! (II, iii, 93)

31. God's me, my horse! (II, iii, 97)
32. A plague upon it! (III, i, 5)
33. And you in hell. (III, i, 11)
34. If your mother's cat had but kittened. (III, i, 19)
35. Is with a kind of colic pinched and vexed. (III, i, 29)
36. And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the Devil
By telling truth. tell truth and shame the Devil (III, i, 58-9)
37. O, while you live, tell truth and shame the Devil! (III, i, 62)
38. Home without boots, and in foul weather, too!
How'scapes he agues, in the Devil's name? (III, i, 68-9)
39. I had rather be a kitten and cry mew
Than one of these same metre ballad-mongers.
(III, i, 129-30)
40. And that would set my teeth nothing on edge,
Nothing so much as mincing poetry. (III, i, 133-34)
41. 'Tis like the forc'd gait of a shuffling nag. (III, i, 135)
42. I'll cavil on the ninth part of a hair. (III, i, 139)
43. And such a deal of skumble-skamble stuff (III, i, 153)
44. In reckoning up the several devils' names. (III, i, 156)
45. I cried "hum" and "well, go to,"
But marked him not a word. O, he is as tedious
As a tired horse, a railing wife. (III, i, 158-60).
46. Worse than a smoky house. (III, i, 160)
47. With cheese and garlic in a windmill. (III, i, 161)
48. Than feed on cates (III, i, 162).
49. In any summer-house in Christendom. (III, i, 163)
50. Now I perceive the Devil understands Welsh. (III, i, 233)
51. By'r lady. (III, i, 235)
52. Heart, you swear like a comfit-maker's wife (III, i, 253)
53. And giv'st such sarcenet surety for thy oaths,
As if thou never walk'st further than Finsbury.
Swear me, Kate, like a lady as thou art,
A good mouth-filling oath, and leave "in sooth"
And such protest of pepper-gingerbread,
To velvet-guards and Sunday citizens. (III, i, 255-260).
54. By God, I cannot flatter; I do defy the tongues of scothers;
(IV, i, 6).
55. Zounds! How has he the leisure to be sick
In such a juggling time? (IV, i, 17-18)

Some of these expressions are, of course, thoroughly conventional in the mouth of the chronicle type of headstrong hero; but in none of the regular chronicle heroes does the Falstaffian language predominate as it does in Hotspur's mouth. This sort of language comes abruptly to an end after the last Falstaffian outburst recorded at the end of the list, No. 55.

From this point on, Hotspur, after the fateful receipt of

the news from his father, acts and speaks in a dignified and calm manner like the other leaders.

It will be noted that besides the fifty-five tavern expressions uttered by Hotspur, there are several important statements made by others in the play which indicate that Hotspur's mind is high-strung like that of Falstaff. Note especially Worcester's frank statement of the danger such language will bring upon Hotspur:

In faith, my lord, you are too wilful-blame,
And since your coming hither have done enough
To put him quite beside his patience
You must needs learn, lord, to amend this fault
Though sometimes it show greatness, courage, blood,—
And that's the dearest grace it renders you,—
Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage,
Defect of manners, want of government,
Pride, haughtiness, opinion, and disdain
The least of which haunting a nobleman
Loseth men's hearts, and leaves behind a stain
Upon the beauty of all parts besides,
Beguiling them of commendation. (*I Henry IV*, III, 1, 177 ff)

So here we see one of Shakspeare's great characters endowed with gifts of nature that make him a great warrior, but he uses a language derived from tavern life. This coarse language is the same realistic touch given in the dialogue between Falstaff and Prince Hal. Both Falstaff and Hotspur are endowed with strong imaginations that are fertile in figures of all kinds. One can easily appreciate the conflict occurring in Malvolio as he persists in using correct language in a realistic setting. With Falstaff, no such inconsistency occurs; his language exactly suits his environment. In Hotspur, Shakspeare again, as in Malvolio, creates a conflict between his language and his environment—only this time the language is realistic and the environment elevated.

In all his chronicle plays, Shakspeare uses language effectively to bring down the dignity of great men to the level of the common man. One of the favorite means of doing this is through quarreling scenes in which royal leaders show in their language a childish petulance, such as that in *Julius Caesar* between Brutus and Cassius, or that between

the Duke of Norfolk and Bolingbroke at the beginning of *Richard II.* The stage effect is enhanced by thus allowing the characters a temporary release from their formal selves. Hotspur's language is illiterate; not only does he drop his dignity to act like a schoolboy, but he uses expressions and figures that one finds only in tavern life.¹

So pronounced is the contrast between Hotspur's station of life and his language that we may reasonably say that his part is humorous up to the point where he receives the message from his father (Act IV, Sc. 1) of the latter's inability to bring up his forces in the ensuing battle. As the story approaches the meeting of Hotspur and Prince Hal, both of these characters speak and act like formal heroes.

The difference between the humor of Falstaff and that of Hotspur is of first importance to us, and after what has been pointed out with regard to Hotspur, we are ready to make comparisons that will indicate the depth and meaning of Falstaff's character. Falstaff is the greatest of Shakspeare's humorous characters because of the variety and subtleness of his mind, ranging from mere clownage to a delicate sense of manhood that was or is in him. The humor on the surface we can readily understand; while the deeper factors we can only feel. In Hotspur, on the other hand, there is no depth of character. The disappointments leading up to the battle of Shrewsbury were sufficient to throw any great hero into a melancholy. But Hotspur has no meditations, like Brutus before Philippi, that reveal a soul. Shakspeare continues to portray Hotspur with nothing more than the mentality of a schoolboy. Only his language changes to show that he realizes the seriousness of the situation. In Falstaff, the language remains the same up to the very end of the play. The jesting in Falstaff often has deep implications, but in Hotspur the feeling is merely on the surface. In the following similar expressions, the one spoken by Falstaff rings from the depth of the whole man:

Hotspur: Say you so, say you so? I say unto you again, you are a shallow cowardly hind, and you lie. (II, iii, 17-18).

Falstaff: A plague of all cowards, I say, and a vengeance too! marry, and amen!—Give me a cup of sack, boy.—Ere I

lead this life long, I'll sew netherstocks, and mend them, and foot them, too A plague of all cowards!—Give me a cup of sack, rogue.—Is there no virtue extant? (II, iv, 129-134).

I fail to find anything suggestive of the melancholy or pessimistic spirit in Hotspur; while Falstaff's very soul at times seems to come to the surface, constantly suggesting a melancholy as permeating as that of Hamlet's. Here, I think, is the secret of Falstaff's humor. The contrast in Hotspur is merely between his coarse expressions and his high aristocratic background. In other words, with Falstaff the conflict is internal; while with Hotspur it is external. This explains why Falstaff is just as humorous when he is alone on the stage as when he is with the Prince.

*Houghton College,
New York.*

¹"The natural speech of a passionate man," John M. Murry, *Shakespeare*, 1936, p. 105.

A NEW MERCHANT

An announcement of unusual interest apprises us of a novel and important venture in the production of *The Merchant of Venice* in New York in the immediate future. The producer and leading actor, the interpreter of Shylock, is Mr. Llfred Gordon, an actor who has for several years scored great successes on the Continent and especially in Australia in his interpretation of many of the most important rôles in classical and in modern drama, including Hamlet, King Lear, and

Francis Moor (in *The Robbers*). Such reviews of his work as we have seen are full of the highest praise of his interpretations, his elocution, and his art.

We are promised some novel features in the production, which is to open at the Barbizon on December 13th. The costuming will be modern, and the play will be interpreted as a plea against anti-semitism. Mr. Gordon is directing the play himself and is drilling a carefully selected cast. We hope that his enthusiasm will be well rewarded.

ANOTHER MEDIEVAL CONVENTION IN SHAKSPERE

By ERNEST H. COX

IN recent years scholarship has done much to project Shakspeare against a background of medieval thought and convention. In 1916 Professor Frank A. Patterson pointed out the presence in Shakspeare of several reflections of lyric forms of the Middle Ages.¹ Since his study there have been numerous other suggestions as to conventional medieval elements in Shakspeare. In 1922 Professor W. W. Lawrence urged that, to a great degree, in literary criticism "the conventions of the Middle Ages may properly be applied to literature of the age of Elizabeth."² Last year another scholar called attention to the persistence in Elizabethan tragedy of the *contemptu mundi* theme, and he mentioned as an example the meditation of Hamlet over Yorick's skull.³ In this particular Shaksperian passage we have not only a recurrence of a medieval theme, but also what should be of even greater interest to the student of Shakspeare: the expression of that theme in a conventional medieval manner—a fact which appears to have escaped general observation.

One of the rhetorical frameworks to which the *contemptu mundi* theme clung most tenaciously is well known as the *ubi sunt* formula. This formula achieved tremendous popularity in the Middle Ages and appeared in various types of medieval literature. More than that, it persisted in Renaissance literature to such an extent and in such notable literary productions as to make it one of the significant contributions of medieval convention to Renaissance expression.

Among the three or four well-defined patterns of the *ubi sunt* formula there is one which inquires after the pleasures and possessions of those who have been long dead. Hawks and hounds, castles and towers, and the eating, drinking, and laughter of the hall are details which become highly conventionalized. The detail which is of present interest concerns merry-making in the great hall. "Where,"

asks the poet of the Old English *The Wanderer*, "has gone the banquet place? Where are the joys of the hall?"⁴ A very similar question is asked by an anonymous poet of the thirteenth century. After he has inquired for those who have lived before him—those who led the hounds and bore the hawks, who possessed field and wood; the rich ladies who wore golden ornaments and had bright countenances—the poet asks,

Were is þat lawing and þat song?⁵

In one of the versions of the *Debate of the Body and Soul*, the soul, after taunting the body for its loss of pride and of such possessions as rich clothes, proud palfreys, greyhounds, falcons, towers, and high halls, inquires,

Where are þy glemen, þat shulde þe glewe
Wiþ harpe and lute and tabourbete?
þe piperes, þat þo bagges blewe . . . ?⁶

In Skelton's elegy on Edward IV, the body of the King is made to lament the loss of its earthly possessions after this fashion:

Where is now my conquest and victory?
Where is my riches and royal aray?
Wher be my coursers and my horses hye,
Where is my myrth, my solas, and my play?
As vanyte, to nought al is wandred away.⁷

With these several passages in mind, one almost feels that, when Hamlet meditates over one skull:

Why may that not be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddities now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks?⁸

and more particularly when he addresses to Yorick's skull such queries as:

Where be your gibes now? your gambols? your songs? your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar?
Not one now, to mock your own grinning? quite chapfallen?⁹

he is falling into a manner of speech already familiar to the literature. Without insisting, however, upon the significance of what, after all, is possibly nothing more than an interesting similarity of situations and expressions, we come to a relationship for which a stronger claim can be made.

A second, and more frequently used, pattern of the *ubi sunt* formula is one in which the names of long-gone heroes are called in catalogue fashion. The origin of the convention is unknown, but an early illustration of it occurs in Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*:

Where are now the bones of staunch Fabricius?
Where is now Brutus, or stern Cato?¹⁰

A Latin hymn of the eleventh century begins,

Where is Plato? Where is Porphyrius?
Where is Tullius, or Virgil?

and stretches the list out to include such renowned ancients as Thales, Empedocles, Aristotle, Alexander, Hector, David, Solomon, Helen, and Paris.¹¹ The thirteenth-century "Cur Mundus Militat" of Jacopone da Todi inquires after Solomon, Samson, Absalom, Jonathan, Cæsar, Dives, Cicero, and Aristotle.¹² Such catalogues are numerous in the Middle Ages. That of Thomas de Hales includes Paris, Helen, Amadis, Tristram, Ysolt, Hector, and Cæsar.¹³ In the fifteenth century, Jacob Ryman and John Lydgate have notable lists.¹⁴ One of Lydgate's passages inquires after Cæsar, Lucan, Octavian, Cicero, Seneca, Cato, and Trajan.¹⁵

It may be observed, further, that the list of worthies was often used illustratively, without the interrogative form. There is an excellent instance of this in Barclay's adaptation of Brandt's *Ship of Fools*:

Take thou example by Julius cesar
That of the worlde durynge a whyle was sure
And many kynges subduyd by myght of warre
And of the Empyre had lordshyp charge cure
But this his myght great space dyd not endure .

This example is followed by those of Darius, Xerxes, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander, Croesus, and Cyrus; and there is presently a fully developed *ubi sunt* passage.¹⁶ Such verses as employ the list without the question form state directly what the regular formula implies. There are numerous examples of this sort of literary convention, a notable one being in William Dunbar.¹⁷

In all these catalogues of names, whether in question form or not, two of the worthies whose names appear most frequently are Julius Cæsar and Alexander. They seem to

have been the most popular, also, as the *ubi sunt* convention moved on into the Renaissance. In an elegy by George Whetstone, we have the two, with Pompey added:

What did become of Cæsar's clymyng head,
Of Pompey's rule, and Alexander's raigne?
A light account, so soone as they were dead? . . .¹⁸

Another elegy, whose authorship is unknown, thus couples the two worthies in rhyme:

Men speake of Hector, of Achilles stoute,
Ofte have I heard of Alexanders name;
Of Ajax, Pyrrhus, all the Gretian route;
Of Scipio, Pompey, and of Cæsar's fame:
Yet that this one is dead, it grieues me more,
Then all the rest, whome I have nam'd before.¹⁹

Samuel Rowlands has an elaborate *ubi sunt* passage, in which he inquires after Methuselah and the patriarchs, Samson, Absalom, Hector, Hercules, Pompey, and Achilles. His concluding lines are:

Wher marcheth Alexander with his drum,
To Cæsar's sceptor who doth yeeld or bow;
Where are those great and mighty conquering ones,
Time, shew an ounce of all their bones²⁰

Christopher Lever, in an elegy on Queen Elizabeth, asks:

Where is the honor of great Macedon,
That measur'd his large empires with his sworde?
Great Julius is with many Cæsars gone,
Leaving no more of honor than the word;
And but the pennies of schollars that record,
Old Time would bring their honor to that shame,
As Cæsar and the rest would have no name.

Who is't that now to Cæsar bends the knee?
Or frames the sweete of wordes to please his eare?
Who is't that now regardeth his decree,
Or his offended countenance doth feare?
Cæsar in's grave, his honor is no where:
If honour thus doe perish in the best,
What may be then expected of the reste?²¹

Robert Southwell's use of the theme is somewhat similar:

Though all the East did quake to hear
Of Alexander's dreadful name,
And all the West did likewise fear
To hear of Julius Cæsar's fame,

Yet both by Death in dust now lie;
Who then can 'scape, but he must die?²²

It is into the convention demonstrated by the foregoing passages that Hamlet falls when he reaches the climax of his grotesque logic:

Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth into dust, the dust is earth, of earth we make loam; and why of that loam, whereto he was converted, might not stop a beer-barrel?

Imperious Cæsar, dead and turn'd to clay,
Might stop a hole to keep the wind away:
O, that that earth, which kept the world in awe,
Should patch a wall to expel the winter's flaw!²³

Mary Hardin-Baylor College
Belton, Tex.

¹Frank A. Patterson, "Shakspeare and the Medieval Lyric," *Shaksperian Studies* (N. Y. Columbia University Press, 1916), pp. 431-452.

²W. W. Lawrence, "The Meaning of *All's Well that Ends Well*," *PMLA* XXXVII (1922), 440-441.

³Willard Farnham, *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936), p. 40.

⁴Ll 92-93.

⁵Carleton Brown, ed., *English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), p. 85.

⁶Hermann Varnhagen, ed., "Zu Mittelenglischen Gedichten," *Anglia*, II (1879), 229-230.

⁷Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Poetical Works of John Skelton* (London, 1843), 2 vols., I, 4.

⁸V, 1, 106-109.

⁹V, 1, 208-212.

¹⁰Book II, Metre 7, Ll 15-18.

¹¹Appendix to *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, ed. Israel Gollancz, no pagination.

¹²F. A. March, ed., *Latin Hymns* (N. Y. Harpers, 1891), p. 176.

¹³Carleton Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹⁴For the Ryman verses, see J. Zupitza, ed., "Die Gedichte des Franziskaners Jakob Ryman," *Archiv*, LXXXIX (1892), 256. The formula is found in Lydgate's "As a Midsomer Rose." See H. N. McCracken, ed., *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate* (London: Early English Text Society, 1934), pp. 780-785.

¹⁵*The Fall of Princes*, Ll 4495-4515.

¹⁶Sebastian Brandt, *The Ship of Fools* (trans. A. Barclay; Edinburgh: Paterson, 1874), I, 268-269.

¹⁷John Small, ed., *The Poems of William Dunbar* (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1893), II, 74.

¹⁸T. Park, *Heliconia*, II, 12.

¹⁹"Verses upon the Report of the Death of the Right Honorable the Lord of Essex," *Ballads from Manuscripts* (ed. F. J. Furnivall), II, 227.

²⁰Samuel Rowlands, "A Bloudy Battell betwixt Time and Death," *Works* (Huntarian Club), I, 25-26.

²¹"Queen Elizabeth's Teares," *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*, III, 679-680.

²²W. T. Turnbull, ed., *The Poetical Works of the Rev Robert Southwell* (London: Smith, 1856), pp. 137-138.

²³V, 1, 231-239.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

SELF-DECEPTION, HOAX OR FRAUD?

Picture Post, Hulton's National Weekly, an English publication, in its issue of April 26, 1941, carries an article by Howard Wadman which is of the greatest interest to all who love William Shakspeare. The essay is entitled "Who wrote in the margin?" and is accompanied by several facsimiles and illustrations, one of which shows us Mr Alan Keen, a London dealer in old books and manuscripts, "at Work on Perhaps the Most Interesting Literary Discovery of our Time" This picture shows Mr. Keen scrutinising a printed page of a 1550 edition of Edward Hall's *Union of the Noble Houses of Lancaster and York* through a reading glass just what Mr Keen expects to find by looking at printed matter this way the writer of the essay does not tell us, but undoubtedly the picture is impressive—to one who is susceptible to this kind of humbug.

Mr. Wadman then tells the usual lurid tale (such as one J. P. Collier has made us familiar with) of a bookseller who receives a shipment of old books from the country in which there is one shabby volume which is carelessly laid aside as being of no interest but which subsequently turns out to be of inestimable value because it contains innumerable marginal notes in the handwriting of no less a person than—William Shakspeare! Mr. Keen, we are told, put his "poor" copy of Hall "*on a shelf* for further attention"; three weeks later he went down "to the cellar" where, opening the book "at random" he found a manuscript note (in Gothic script) opposite an underlined passage in the history of Henry V which is "precisely the tag that

Shakespeare puts into the mouth of the Archbishop of Canterbury" in his *Henry V* (I, ii, 38,—"*In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant*"). On further examination it proved that the volume contained 405 notes covering the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V, and that "in the great majority of cases the points to which they refer have been embodied in the plays."

"The ink and calligraphy of the notes have been carefully tested by [unnamed!] experts, and forgery seems out of the question" As "positive evidence"—of what?—we are told that the book had belonged to Richard Newport, who was related by marriage to the Underhills, the leading family of Stratford, from whom Shakspeare bought New Place. Shakspeare *may* have been a visitor at the Underhills, he *may* have had access to their library, Newport's book *may* have been in the Underhill library (they *may* have had a library), and he *may* have read and underscored and annotated this book (visitors *may* do this), and so forth Then the mighty magician converted Hall's prose into the world's most splendid poetry Shakspeare scholars, says Mr Wadman "may now learn more about the poet's mind and method than has been learned in all the intervening years." And, believe it or not, this book is now insured for the paltry sum of £150,000! Mr. Wadman modestly suggests that "this national discovery, made at the very time of Dunkirk, brings us nearer to the heart of England."

Having examined these facsimiles, which are reproduced with unusual clarity for a magazine article, we wish to say:

1) the writings are good (skillful)

secretary script which, if genuine, might have been written at any time between c 1575 and 1625;

- 2) there is no apparent reason for suspecting the genuineness of the writings reproduced in the essay;
- 3) the writing bears not the remotest personal resemblance in the formation of the letters to the seven extant Shakspeare signatures.

It may be noted in conclusion that Shakspeare's source for the English historical plays mentioned above was Ralph Holinshed's *Chronicles*, not Hall's book. Every point made by Hall is made also by Holinshed. We hope, however, that this fact will not be thought to lend support to the claim made not long ago, on very similar grounds, by the Countess de Chambrun, that a certain Stratford dealer's copy of a Holinshed is verily Shakspeare's annotated copy of one of his favorite source books.

SHAKSPEARE'S RIMES

We have recently received a nicely printed, neatly bound and well-written dissertation entitled *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays* (New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. xii-168, \$3.). The author is Dr. Frederick W. Ness, instructor of English at Yale. Dr. Ness has conducted his study of his subject in a scholarly manner and has reported his results in a readable though not exciting book. He has carefully and sensibly examined and criticised the conclusions and dicta of many of his predecessors. His own conclusions present nothing startling or of great importance. Shakspeare, we gather, used rime and refrained from using rime as he pleased. Why he sometimes pleased to do so, especially in certain of his plays and at certain periods in his career is, we think, as

much of a mystery now as before the publication of Dr. Ness's useful summary.

For an American university production this book has been exceptionally well proofread. The only misprint (?) we have to record is "Parrot" for "Parrott" on p. 162. There is one point, however, to which we seriously object: inconsistency in the capitalization of German substantives. Why, for example, do we have (on p. 161) "Vers" and "dramen," "Stichomythie" and "gleichklang," "Verwendung" and "reimes" and "blankverse" and "zeit," etc.

In one thing only has Dr. Ness's work disappointed us. He has failed to consult a number of important essays and books dealing with his subject which he might have read with profit to himself and to his readers. From among these we select for mention the following. R. Hillier's *First Principles of Verse* (1938), L. M. Griffith's *Evenings with Sh* (1889), T. Swift's "On the rise and progress of rhyme" (in *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, 1801), T. W. Herbert's "The grammar of rhyme" (in *Sewanee Review*, July, 1940), Batteux & Schlegel's *Einschränkung der schönen Künste* (Leipzig, 1770—contains a chapter on rime); Miss E. L. Antz's thesis on "Rhyme and the enjoyment of poetry" (Columbia University, 1926), R. Gottschall's *Poetik* (Breslau, 1893), R. G. Bindig's "Wesen und Wert des Reims" (*Die Literatur*, Oct., 1936), K. Weiss's "Reim und Refrain" (*Imago*, Dec., 1913), C. de Polier's essay on rime in *European Magazine* (Feb., 1786), H. Corson's *A Primer of English Verse* (1893), F. W. Felkin's *The Poet's Craft* (n.d.), J. L. Lowes' *Rhyme & Metre* (1919), J. A. Symonds's *Blank Verse* (1895), B. J. Pendlebury's discussion of "Rhyme in drama" in *Dryden's Heroic Plays* (1923), H. P. Biddle's "Analysis of rime" in *Prose*

Miscellany (1881), R. Alden's *Introduction to Poetry* (1909,—and the French books there referred to) and J. C. Andersen's *The Laws of Verse* (1928). A reference to Capell's idea that Shakspeare abandoned rime because he found that, like doggerel, it caused actors difficulty in delivery,

would have been of some interest, and so would mention of Mark Liddell's idea that unrimed verse gives "variety and fluency to English poetry."

But, for all this, Dr Ness has provided Shakspeare scholars with a useful book which they will find themselves consulting fairly often

COMMUNICATION

Editor of the *Bulletin*.

In his anniversary lecture of 1916, the late Professor Kittredge remarked that "there neither is nor can be any exclusive or orthodox interpretation" of the characters in Shakspeare. Holding, as I certainly do, to this belief, I am sorry to feel that Mr Hannigan implies that I am dogmatic, putting an emphasis on a hypothetical "party line," refusing to leave any matter "to the readers to decide or not to decide, if the point interests them, as if they were audiences" I certainly did not "blow-torch as an untutored heretic" anyone who disagreed with me, and I was not aware of suggesting that my "conjecture" was "an inerrable finality." I hasten to assure Mr Hannigan of my interest in his comments, and of my firm belief in his right to hold to his interpretation. He may even be Portia right!

But I believe that Shakspeare and his audience felt an appropriateness in the epithet Daniel as applied to a "judge" because of their familiarity with the story of Susanna (which they may not have derived directly from the Apocrypha). The stories of Susanna and Shylock are obviously not parallel in every detail; but that, again, is beside the point. There is no ques-

tion of the rôle of Susanna being transferred from Shylock to Antonio, for the groundlings are prepared at the end of Act III for Portia's aid to the merchant, and surely grasp the irony of Shylock's joy when she apparently gives him an advantage. This, of course, is one of the many details which we do not find in the Susanna story, we hear nothing of Daniel leading the elders on to think he will support them. Shylock does not "crash the gate" (any more than do the elders), he is the complainant—he has Antonio arrested (III, iii), and "the Duke shall grant me justice." What need of haling him to Court, or even inviting him? Is he not (so to speak) the host at the party? He does not, as do the elders, bear false witness against his intended victim, but, in both stories, the case seems to go against the one with whom the reader (or audience) sympathizes, and the dramatic reversal (due to Portia and Daniel) serves to underline a resemblance between two figures who at the moment are central.

I am glad to be called "a true Shakspeare spirit" (though I have failed to shake Mr Hannigan's spirit), and thank him for that word.

ROBERT WITHERINGTON

